



3 1761 12062266 7

CAZONDE 61
-M35

ONTARIO

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF MEETINGS

7 October 1969 - 16 December 1969



COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held
on Tuesday, 7th October, 1969, in the office
of the President, Brock University, St.
Catharines, at 10:00 a.m.

Minute

1567

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright
Dr. M. E. Arthur
Dr. R. Gerstein
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes
Dr. M. J. Lavigne
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.
Dr. J. G. Parr
Dr. R. J. Rossiter
Dr. D. W. Slater

Chairman

Mr. H. A. Cotnam

Mr. E. E. Stewart
Mr. A. P. Gordon
Mr. J. S. Bancroft

Secretary

Dr. Wright welcomed Dr. J. G. Parr to the Committee. He explained that Dr. Parr and one other person were being named to the Committee but that final arrangements had not been concluded in time to make public the announcement of these appointments.

1568

MINUTES

It was agreed that consideration of the minutes of previous meetings should be deferred until a future meeting of the Committee.

1569

CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Dr. H. G. Thode, McMaster University, Concerning Computer Allowance for Extra-Formula Grant for Medicine.
In considering McMaster's request for an extra-formula grant for Medicine in providing computer allowances, it was noted that all programs receiving emergent grants should be included, not just Medicine, if such an allowance were to be made for this factor in calculating the computer grants. It was agreed that consideration of this item should be deferred until a future meeting to allow time for the necessary calculations to be made and in order to determine the implications of this suggestion.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761120622667>

B. Dr. J. F. Leddy, University of Windsor, Concerning New University Development

In his letter, Dr. Leddy pointed out that planning should start almost immediately if adequate preparations are to be made for the development of any new universities in the late 1970's. It was agreed to discuss further this question at a subsequent meeting of the Committee.

1570 SCHEME FOR AUDIT OF ENROLMENT

Mr. Bancroft reported that the annual audit of enrolment had commenced at the Ontario universities and referred to the papers which had been distributed to the Committee concerning this matter. He indicated that the scheme appeared to be working, although some problems had become apparent.

Mr. Stewart reminded the members that the Committee on University Affairs had agreed that it was the responsibility of the Department of University Affairs to ensure the validity of enrolment figures upon which grants were based and that they had agreed with the Committee of Presidents that the universities' own independent auditors should carry out this audit procedure. He indicated that it was essential for the auditors either to give an unqualified opinion or, failing that, to extend their examination so that its end product could be the reporting of a material variance which would serve as a basis for adjusting the grant which had been paid. The importance of receiving such an audit report was recognized by the Committee.

1571 FORMULA FINANCING FOR PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION

The Chairman reported that he had received a memorandum from the Minister of University Affairs requesting a study to establish the formula weights for operating grants for all programs in education. He reported that, in anticipation of the Committee's concurrence, he had already requested the Joint Subcommittee on Formula Financing to examine this matter and to prepare appropriate recommendations. Dr. Slater had been asked to head a small group to undertake this study. Dr. Slater reported that he intended to ask a small advisory group, including financial officers, education officials, and others directly concerned with this area of activity, to assist his study group. It was noted that a special meeting might have to be held to consider this particular item in advance of the final meeting of the Committee at which time recommendations for operating support would be determined.

Mr. Stewart reported that the Treasury Board had established "guidelines" for each department of Government for assistance in preparing budget estimates for 1970-71. These guidelines would indicate the total upper limit which the Treasury Board would be prepared to support for university education. This limit would include all programs in one total, thus the Committee on University Affairs would be requested to bear in

mind the relationship of such items as operating grants, student aid, and special grants when it prepared its final recommendations.

1572 PROCEDURES FOR COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS HEARINGS IN FALL OF 1969

This item was tabled as information, since the letter outlining these procedures had been mailed previously to the Committee members and to the universities concerned. It was noted that each university would be responsible for issuing tickets and that only members of their own university community should be eligible to attend.

1573 DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS PROGRAM OF GRANTS-IN-AID OF RESEARCH

The Chairman noted that this program had been under review and that now, when all programs were being considered within a total context, some further consideration was required. He noted the letter from Dr. Slater, as well as comments which had been received from others, concerning the efficacy and impace of this program of assistance.

Mr. Stewart noted that if the program of Grants-In-Aid of Research were to continue in 1970 preparations should be made for the distribution of forms and other material almost immediately.

Dr. Slater reported that some discussion of this program had been held by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. He indicated that that body realized the ineffectiveness of spreading a limited resource over a broader range and that, consequently, a suggestion had been made to broaden the program to include other fields but to narrow the grants to young "new" faculty members. In addition, it was suggested that the "mission" aspect be continued. It was noted that the points raised by the OCGS would come forward through the Committee of Presidents at a later date.

It was also suggested that consideration be given to abandoning the existing program and to re-allocating the funds to more direct research programs which would be of specific interest to higher education.

The Chairman agreed to prepare some documentation on this subject for consideration at the next meeting of the Committee.

1574 ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION WITH THE COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS

A. Salary Study

The Chairman distributed copies of a letter addressed to Dr. Sylvia Ostry of the Economic Council of Canada requesting an objective study of faculty salaries in the provincially-assisted universities of Ontario. He explained

that the study was being supported jointly by CPUO, CUA and OCUFA.

B. Formula Grants for New Program at the University of Toronto

Dr. Wright reminded the Committee that last year the University of Toronto had been assured they would not be penalized within the structure of weights under the operating grants formula for introducing the "New Program" in Arts and Science. He indicated that the University wished to have all students classed as honours whereas others have suggested that all students might be classed as general course students.

Mr. Bancroft reported that the average weight for Arts and Science at the University of Toronto in 1967-68 was 1.19. In 1968-69 it was 1.20. The question then arose as to whether in 1969-70 the rates should be identical to 1968-69 or whether they should reflect some further increase in the average.

After some discussion, it was agreed that the actual average weightings in 1967-68 and 1968-69 should be recalculated to at least three decimal places before making a final recommendation.

C. New Programs

Mr. Stewart reported receipt of a formal complaint from the Committee of Presidents concerning the provision outlined in the information distributed by the Department of University Affairs that the Government would not accept financial responsibility for any new programs which had not had prior recommendation by the Committee on University Affairs. He indicated that the Presidents might raise this issue since some apparently felt it was an infringement on university autonomy.

D. Other Items

The Chairman reported that preliminary indications of enrolment, albeit incomplete, had indicated significant overruns of projections by some institutions. He reminded the Committee of the difficulty faced when the Department of University Affairs was forced to go back to the Treasury Board with a request for supplementary funds. He explained that the Treasurer had indicated that such a situation could not exist on a continuing basis; thus the question was raised of the ability of the formula system of grants to continue under the open-ended scheme which currently existed. Professor Rossiter suggested that the over-run in undergraduates in the current year might be offset by lower graduate enrolment.

Mr. Stewart also raised the problem which would be created if a number of universities had surplus operating funds of any magnitude at the end of the fiscal year. Although modest surpluses were expected under the formula system, presence of general surpluses among a majority of the universities would inevitably raise the question of whether the Government had been too generous during the preceding year in allocating grant funds. He suggested that the Minister might be faced with this question when he presented his estimates to the Treasury Board.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the joint meeting of the Committee on University Affairs and the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario held on Tuesday, 7th October, 1969, in the Board Room, 13th Floor, Brock Tower, Brock University at

11:15 a.m.

Minute
1575

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright	Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur	
Dr. R. Gerstein	
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.	
Dr. J. G. Parr	
Dr. R. J. Rossiter	
Dr. D. W. Slater	

Mr. H. A. Cotnam

Mr. E. E. Stewart	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. J. S. Bancroft	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	

Dr. Wright introduced Dr. J. G. Parr to the Committee of Presidents and explained that Dr. Parr had recently been appointed to the Committee although public notice had not yet been given of this fact.

COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS DELEGATION

Brock University -
Dr. J. A. Gibson, President
Professor A. J. Earp, Provost and Vice-President

Carleton University -
Dr. A. D. Dunton, President (Chairman)
Professor G. R. Love, Professor of Physics and
Director of Planning

University of Guelph -
Dr. B. C. Matthews (for Dr. W. C. Winegard, President)
Professor E. P. Benson, Acting Chairman, Department of
English Language and Literature,
Wellington College

Lakehead University -

Dr. W. G. Tamblyn, President

Mr. H. J. Parker, Assistant to the President,
Member of Philosophy Department

Laurentian University -

Mr. S. G. Mullins, President

McMaster University -

Dr. H. G. Thode, President

Professor R. C. McIvor, Department of Economics

University of Ottawa -

Dr. Roger Guindon, O.M.I., Rector

Dean Paul Hagen, School of Graduate Studies

Queen's University -

Dr. J. J. Deutsch, Principal

Professor M. Estall, Department of Philosophy

University of Toronto -

Mr. J. H. Sword (for Dr. C. T. Bissell, President)

Professor W. H. Rapson, Department of Chemical
Engineering

Trent University -

Professor T. H. B. Symons, President

Professor R. H. Sadleir, Vice-President

The University of Waterloo -

Dr. H. E. Petch, President pro tem

Professor P. G. Cornell, Department of History

The University of Western Ontario -

Dr. D. C. Williams, President

Professor S. J. R. Noel, Department of Political
Science and Member of Senate

University of Windsor -

Dr. J. F. Leddy, President

York University -

Dr. D. M. Healy, Acting President

Professor Harry Arthurs, Osgoode Hall Faculty of Law

Secretariat -

Dr. J. B. Macdonald, Executive Vice-Chairman

Mr. B. L. Hansen, Director of Research

Mr. J. A. d'Oliveira, Secretary

Mr. P. Haeffling, Assistant Secretary

Guests -

Dean E. Sirluck, Chairman, Ontario Council on
Graduate Studies

Professor B. Etkin, Chairman, Subcommittee on
Operating Grants

Mr. D. M. Hedden, Chairman, Subcommittee on
Capital Financing

1576 SALARY STUDY

Dr. Wright tabled with the Committee of Presidents the letter outlining the request for a study of faculty salaries. Dr. Macdonald indicated that the Committee of Presidents endorsed this study, as did the Ontario Confederation of Faculty Associations. It was noted that this study would not be completed in time to be used during preparation of the Committee's recommendations for grants in 1970-71.

1577 FORMULA GRANTS FOR "NEW PROGRAM", UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Dr. Wright indicated the intention to have the weighting for students in the New Program at the University of Toronto counted on the basis of the average actual weights for 1968-69. He explained that this process would be followed only in 1969-70 and that, because of the changes in curricula occurring at a number of universities, it probably would be appropriate to attempt to accommodate the needs of a number of different programs within some simpler formula process. He explained, as well, that the actual weighting for Arts and Science at the University of Toronto required further evaluation before a final decision could be made.

President Dunton, on behalf of several universities, indicated that he had criticized the different weights being granted for honours and general programs when the formula was introduced. He stated that he felt these had been based on incorrect educational philosophies and, therefore, he supported a change to a "more sensible" weighting. He indicated further that he supported the use of an average weight for the University of Toronto as a temporary move only, not as a permanent solution.

Documentation containing the recommendations of the Joint Subcommittee on Finance in regard to the formula financing arrangements to apply to the new program in Arts and Science for 1969-70 at the University of Toronto was distributed.

Mr. Sword indicated that the University of Toronto was looking at this proposal and that they anticipated more basic discussion between the Committee of Presidents and the Committee on University Affairs on this topic.

During the discussion which followed it was noted that representatives of the University of Toronto felt that their university would suffer some disadvantage under this proposal

while others felt that the University of Toronto had an advantage.

It was recognized that further study would be required in the context of the needs of all the Ontario universities.

- 1578 PROPOSAL FOR COUNTING GRADUATE ENROLMENT FOR FORMULA PURPOSES
Copies were distributed of the Report on the Counting of Graduate Students under the Ontario Formula for Operating Grants, dated 7th October, 1969.* Mr. Bancroft explained that this was much the same document as had been distributed earlier, with the only changes incorporated therein being noted on the cover sheet attached to the report. Dr. Macdonald noted that these changes tended to "liberalize" the document previously approved by the Committee of Presidents.

A memorandum from Mr. Bancroft to Dr. Wright concerning Item 5 of changes was distributed. In this memorandum, Mr. Bancroft pointed out that further review was required on this point. In recognition of this, it was agreed that this document should be approved as distributed on the understanding that this approval did not preclude further changes in the weighting of summer school graduate students after further consideration was given to the matter.

LUNCHEON

- 1579 CPUO BRIEF RE SUPPORT IN 1970-71
Copies of the brief of the Committee of Presidents entitled, "Preliminary Estimates of Requirements for Funds in 1970-71 Under the Ontario Formula for Operating Grants", dated 7th October, 1969, were distributed.** President Dunton indicated that this preliminary brief attempted to establish a "kind of order of magnitude for next year".

Among the points which were made during the following discussion were the following:

- It was noted that television was not a trade-off, and that, therefore, it added to the total expense of operating a university.
- Dr. Macdonald reported that Professor Hanly of OCUFA had written to comment on the use of 10 per cent instead of the OCUFA request for a 20 per cent increase in faculty salaries. He quoted from the letter from Professor Hanly which stated that OCUFA was reconsidering its policy in light of the work of the joint OCUFA/CPUO Committee and thus Hanly was not anxious to see these figures used.
- Dr. Macdonald expressed the concern of the CPUO that a

* See Appendix A

** See Appendix B

large part of the increment in cost could be attributed to enrolment increases, which CPUO estimated at 15 per cent for the coming year and for each subsequent year during the years immediately ahead. He indicated that the Committee of Presidents did not wish to see the open-ended admissions policy continued at the expense of deterioration of quality. During the discussion of this aspect, the relationship between the growth of the gross provincial product and the increase in costs of operating universities was compared. In addition, Dr. Wright drew to the attention of the Committee of Presidents the problems involved when universities had significant annual overruns in their enrolment.

- Mention was also made of the fact that the problem of weighting of programs in education had been referred to the Joint Subcommittee on Formula Financing. Dr. Wright explained that a budget review basis would be required during the transition stage. He indicated that it might be appropriate to anticipate a separate, special meeting with those universities interested in teacher education before final recommendations could be made.

1580 SEF/SYSTEM BUILDING

Mr. R. Robbie of the Metropolitan Toronto School Board Study of Educational Facilities described in some detail, with accompanying slides, the SEF System Building program developed in Toronto.

At the conclusion of the discussion, it was agreed that a small committee comprising Dr. Wright, Dr. Macdonald, Mr. Hedden and Mr. McCullough should study this method of operation in relation to the universities' needs and report to the Committee of Presidents and the Committee on University Affairs. It was noted that the problems of student housing should be included in the analysis made by this committee.

1581 DATA BANK REQUIREMENTS

Dr. Wright explained the mutual concern of all those involved to ensure that the quality and nature of data required by various groups and agencies, such as CUA, CPUO, DUA and others, should be maintained with a minimum of total effort, safeguarding at the same time the information in order that all interested parties would have their needs met without suffering any loss in control of basic information or of the confidentiality of certain types of information.

Dr. Macdonald indicated that the Committee of Presidents had been developing a proposal for the data bank under the CPUO since they felt this would serve the needs of all interested parties in better fashion than would an independent data bank which operated under joint sponsorship. He explained that,

in the eyes of the CPUO, they were in a much better position to supply the required information to such organizations as AUCC, DBS, OCUFA, CUS, OUS, DUA, CUA, CPUO, CAUBO, OURA, OCGS and CAUT. He suggested that an independently operated bank could not control access and that the users would not have enough confidence in the analytical capacity of such an agency. He suggested that CPUO was prepared to have a paper ready by mid-November on this topic on the understanding that no steps would be taken by CPUO, CUA or DUA in the meantime which would prejudice a final decision. Meanwhile, it was agreed that the Department of University Affairs might define its data requirements.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary



DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
Recent changes incorporated in the Draft Report
on the Counting of Graduate Students under the
Ontario Formula for Operating Grants.

Item of Report

Change

- 11 A (i) To the previous wording (The student must have, as a prerequisite, an honours undergraduate degree or its equivalent.) has been added the following footnote:
- NOTE: Except for all students enrolled in Category 5 graduate programmes.
- 11 A (ii) Previous wording: Notwithstanding the above condition, students enrolled in programmes leading to the first professional degrees itemized below are not considered to be graduate students: Social Work, Library Science, Law, Medicine.
- Present wording: Notwithstanding the above condition, students enrolled in programmes leading to the baccalaureate degrees in the following professional fields are not considered to be graduate students: Social Work, Library Science, Law, Medicine.
- 11 A (iii) Previous version: Such students [i.e. students holding an undergraduate general degree enrolled in a "qualifying year"] are to be separately reported and accounted for on a trimester basis.
- In this report the requirement for trimester reporting of "qualifying year" students has been deleted.
- 11 C (b) A change from the previous version only in the order in which the requirements are listed:
- The student shall -
- (i) be geographically available and visit the campus regularly
 - (ii) not be regularly employed
 - (iii) identify himself as a full-time graduate student.
- Previous order: (iii), (i), (ii).
- II and III "Summer School" graduate students now dealt with within the full-time category; (previously regarded as part-time).



DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
A REPORT ON THE COUNTING OF GRADUATE STUDENTS
UNDER THE ONTARIO FORMULA FOR OPERATING GRANTS
7th OCTOBER, 1969

(ORIGINATING WITH THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON
FINANCE/OPERATING GRANTS)

Introduction

- (i) Experience gained since the inception of the Ontario Formula for Operating Grants, together with certain technical difficulties associated with the notion of trimester enrolment reporting have indicated a need, which is now widely acknowledged, to amend the methods and procedures for establishing formula entitlements at the graduate level. This matter has been a subject of review and discussion by all interested parties during the past year.
- (ii) As a result of this process there has emerged a consensus as to this comprehensive scheme to effect those changes which it has been agreed are necessary. In particular, the assistance of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies has been most helpful. Their views and recommendations are reflected in the proposals set out below.
- (iii) Given the urgency for dealing effectively with the difficulties and problems associated with the counting of graduate students for formula purposes these proposals are to be effective commencing in 1969-70.
- (iv) It is the intent of the Joint Subcommittee that the recommendations should result in significant improvements to the existing procedures for establishing the counting of graduate students for formula purposes without significantly altering the amounts of operating grants which would have been otherwise generated in 1969-70 if existing arrangements had been continued.

Definitions (Applicable only for purposes of the Formula and for the reporting of Enrolment to the Provincial Government).

(A) Prerequisites for Graduate Student Status

- (i) The student must have, as a prerequisite, an honours undergraduate degree or its equivalent. (Note)
- (ii) Notwithstanding the above condition, students enrolled in programmes leading to the baccalaureate degrees in the following professional fields are not considered to be graduate students:

Social Work, Library Science, Law, Medicine

Note: Except for all students enrolled in Category 5 graduate programmes.

- (iii) All students holding an undergraduate general degree or its equivalent, as opposed to an undergraduate honours degree or its equivalent, are not to be considered graduate students irrespective of whether or not they are so regarded by the University in which they are registered. Students in this latter category, for convenience, may be identified as "qualifying" students and should be "weighted" as undergraduates for purposes of the formula.

This category may also, at a university's discretion, include students proceeding from an honours degree in one discipline to a graduate degree (with thesis requirement) in another discipline even though such students could have been dealt with as graduate students.

(B) Eligible (Active) graduate students

Conditions of Eligibility for Formula Grant Purposes
(subject to limitations on total entitlement - see Part V).

- (a) The student must be enrolled in a programme of studies meeting the requirements of the appraisals procedure established by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. *
- (b) The student must be making substantial demands upon the resources of the University in which he is registered.

Graduate students who are registered at a University but who are inactive are ineligible and are to be disregarded for purposes of enrolment reporting.

(C) Requirements for classification as a Full-Time Graduate Student

It should be understood that this category is intended only for those graduate students whose studies are a full-time occupation.

- (a) The University shall designate the student as a full-time graduate student.
- (b) The student shall -
- (i) be geographically available and visit the campus regularly.

It is understood, of course, that a graduate student may be absent from his university while still under supervision, e.g. visiting libraries, attending a graduate course at another institution, field work, etc. If such periods of absence exceed four weeks in any term written evidence shall be available in the Graduate Studies Office to the effect that the absence has the approval of the Chairman of the Department and the Dean of Graduate Studies.

* New graduate programmes (Ph.D. programmes established after 1st January, 1967 and Masters' programmes established after 1st July, 1967) must be favourably appraised by the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies if students registered in those programmes are to be counted for purposes of the calculation of formula grants.

In view of this, a student carrying on experimental work in an external laboratory would not normally be considered as a full-time student except by written permission of the graduate dean upon recommendation of the supervisor.

- (ii) not be regularly employed, except in the most exceptional circumstances, on other work, or by the University, for more than an average of 10 hours per week for any period for which he is registered as a full-time graduate student * and not be employed outside the university except by permission of the supervisor.

* If the student is employed as a teaching fellow or demonstrator, the 10 hours per week should represent the total time spent by the student in connection with the appointment, i.e., it includes time spent on preparative work, reading set assignments, marking examinations, etc.

- (iii) identify himself as a full-time graduate student

There shall be a special full-time category known as "summer school" graduate students. This category will be for students (meeting the requirements for full-time status listed above) who are enrolled for a summer period of not less than six nor more than eight weeks.

(D) Part-time Graduate Student

All active graduate students other than full-time graduate students as provided for in the categories shown above are part-time graduate students.

1. Reporting of Part-Time, and Full-Time "Summer School", Graduate Enrolments

- (1) The provisions contained in Part D, Note 4 items ii (course basis for establishing full-time equivalence) and iii (thesis only students) under Categorization and Weighting in the Formula Document discontinue.
- (2) Trimester reporting, as outlined below, will apply for part-time graduate enrolment as well as full-time graduate enrolment.
- (3) The full-time equivalents of both part-time and "summer school" graduate enrolments are to be arrived at by multiplying student numbers by a conversion factor of .30 for all such graduate students.

Amplifications of Trimester Reporting (Note 6, Table of Categories, Formula Document).

- (1) The academic year on the trimester basis will consist of three semesters.

Fall Semester (September - December) NOTE - "summer school" enrolment will be reported in this semester.

Winter Semester (January - April)

Spring Semester (May - August)

- (2) The counting of graduate students will be established as at December 1st for the Fall Semester, March 1st for the Winter Semester and July 1st for the Spring Semester.

V. Entitlements for the University in respect of Individual Graduate Students.

(1) <u>Formula Category</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
Category 6 (weight 3.0)	3	6
Category 7 (weight 4.0)	4	8
Category 8 (weight 6.0)	21 *	27 *

* cumulative, to include earned entitlement carried forward from Category 6 or Category 7 status as case might be.

- (2) Unallocated balance of the minimum entitlement is to become due at the time the student graduates.
- (3) The limits referred to above to be inaugurated commencing with the 1968-69 academic session as the first year for accumulating the total units to be counted against individual students even though some students will have registered for their programmes previous to that year.
- (4) (a) There shall be no minimum entitlement for students transferring into the Ontario Universities system with advanced graduate standing.
- (b) A graduate student transferring from one university to another within the Ontario system shall also transfer only the remainder of his maximum total unit entitlement.
- (5) The minima and maxima entitlements should not be regarded as a measure of the appropriate duration for completing graduate work at either the master's degree or doctoral level. However, on the basis of some review of recent experience as to the time required to complete graduate programmes, these initial limitations appear to be reasonable. It is the view of the Joint Subcommittee that there be a continuing review and study of these limitations over a two-year period and that a revision of limits downward is desirable if experience warrants.

J.S.B.

10/2/69

BRIEF TO THE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATES OF REQUIREMENTS FOR
FUNDS IN 1970-71 UNDER THE
ONTARIO FORMULA FOR OPERATING GRANTS

COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS OF
UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
OPERATING GRANTS

October 7, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction	1
Summary of Presidents' Comments on 1969-70 Unit Value	3
Projections of Enrolment & Financial Implications for 1970-71	7
Increases in University Costs	10
Appendix A	A-1
Appendix B	B-1
Appendix C	C-1

INTRODUCTION

The brief which follows contains preliminary estimates of university operating fund requirements for 1970-71. These estimates must be considered very tentative at this time, since 1969-70 final information on enrolment, income units, and distribution of expenditures to various components is not available as yet. We have thus restricted ourselves to a general level of analysis, which will be considerably amplified in the final brief to be presented on December 16.

Our approach in past submissions has been to separate the unit value into components of cost per unit, measure the changes in patterns of distribution of these costs, and attempt to project these costs into the budget year taking salary trends, maintenance of staff-student ratios, and apparent cost changes in other components into account. All of this culminated in suggested increases to the value of the unit with alternative staff-to-weighted enrolment ratios. A feature of past reports was a trade-off table which showed present academic salary expense per unit and alternatives of possible expenses per unit with different staff to weighted enrolment ratios and increases to average salaries. Thus, alternative courses of action involving the variables of new staff, income units, and increases to average salary could be examined in advance of the budget year and actual decisions taken later could be assessed historically. We will continue this type of analysis in the future because it is of obvious value.

The structure of the final report will thus be similar to those of the past two years; the sophistication of the analysis, however, will be improved as a result of the greater research resources we now have. Our research staff is currently engaged in collecting additional data for comparison of salaries, both academic and non-academic. Analyses of non-salary costs will be considerably amplified in the future. For this year we will be largely restricted to the DUA reporting forms for our university cost data, but greater use will be made of external cost indicators. In the future, we will be seeking to develop improved indicators of non-salary costs.

For this preliminary submission, we are able to present the following: (1) a summary of Presidents' comments on the impact of the 5.5% increase in unit value for 1969-70, (2) projections of enrolments and income units in 1970-71 with financial implications of increments to unit value and growth in income units, and (3) preliminary analyses of university cost increases in the past year with comparisons to external indicators having university cost implications.

Appendix A contains tabular material on the financial implications of projections of enrolment and alternative unit values. Appendix B contains comparisons of salary levels at Canadian universities in 1968-69. Appendix C contains a projection of university cost increases for 1970-71 alternative to that shown in the text.

SUMMARY OF PRESIDENTS' COMMENTS ON THE 1969-70 UNIT VALUE

Comments were solicited from the president of each member institution about the impact on university operations of the 5.5% increase in the value of the BIU for 1969-70. The comments received were necessarily fairly general in nature, since definitive information on budgets, faculty/student ratios, class sizes, etc., will not be available until final enrolments are known. Since much of the budgetary and academic planning has already taken place, however, the overall impact is clear.

The comments received indicate a common conviction that the universities of Ontario find themselves in a marked financial squeeze for 1969-70. The increases in academic salaries that the universities found it necessary to grant averaged about 10%; it therefore follows that the 5.5% increase in the value of the BIU must lead either to a diversion of funds from other components of expenditure, or to a deterioration in staff/student ratios. One or other or both effects were noted by a number of institutions. We will have more detailed documentation of these effects in the December submission. The following specific effects were reported:

- increases in average teaching loads
- increases in average class sizes
- deferment of planned new programmes
- shortages in budgets for administrative services, supplies, equipment, library books, etc.

Deterioration in staff/student ratios expected by certain institutions would necessitate increases in average teaching loads and/or increases in average class sizes. The following comment received from an institution anticipating both effects is illustrative:

With the ever-increasing number of applicants to the University there has been a rise in class sizes in certain elementary courses to unprecedented levels.... In earlier times an influx of students was handled by increasing the numbers of sections in the course but in the present circumstances this method seems no longer possible. In the case of foreign language instruction the group size has been almost doubled with the consequence that, in the view of the instructors, the quality of instruction has seriously suffered.

Another likely effect on academic functions of a budgetary squeeze is deferment of planned new programmes. Several institutions reported that this had happened.

With respect to non-academic areas of operation, most of the institutions reported substantial shortages in budgets for administrative services and all non-salary expenditures. The following comments on administrative services were made by two different institutions:

The desired rate of acquisition of staff, both in quality and quantity for many of the organizations providing academic services, student services, and administrative services exceeded the university's ability to fund.

Because we have maintained the academic portion of the budget at a level similar to previous years... it has been the administrative non-academic areas that have suffered primarily. The demands on the administrative services are increasing rapidly, and because of our inability to support them properly, it has meant a drop in their efficiency, and in the amount of services they can provide....The increasing complexity of the university, and the variety of reports required for various purposes are adding tremendous loads in the administrative area. With the advent of specialized equipment, such as computers, which are necessary for this type of analysis... there is also a built-in operating cost in order to maintain and properly utilize such equipment.

With respect to non-salary items of expenditure, severe cutbacks or freezing of expenditure at previous levels (without allowance for price increases) were employed by most institutions. A number reported levels of budget for preventive maintenance that they regarded as dangerously low. Expenditures on supplies, equipment, computing, renovations, and library books all suffered at a number of institutions. Several reported actual cuts in budgets for library acquisitions (in one case, a reduction to 60% of last year's level). One institution reported the use of television severely restricted through lack of funds.

To sum up the above comments, the following general remarks from three universities might be helpful. Each of these statements, incidentally, indicates the cumulative effect of budgetary stringency over successive years.

While the University has been able to establish a balanced provisional budget on the basis of the above procedures, it seems clear that they can be considered only as a short-term solution to financial duress. If the current level of support is to be continued on a long-term basis, there seems to be no doubt that academic standards must deteriorate seriously.

I think the important factor to be considered in discussions of this type is that we have been literally squeezing the fat out of the budget for three or four years, and I honestly believe that we are now at the point where no further fat exists, even beyond that, I do not believe that we can operate efficiently at the present level of support. There is no doubt that salary demands of faculty associations in the immediate years ahead will be similar to those that we have received in recent years, namely in the order of 15% to 20%. In our own particular case, such increases cannot be contemplated any longer with an increase in the BIU of approximately 5%. There is also a limit to the extent in which maintenance can be deferred on the one hand, and library purchases and academic equipment on the other hand. We strongly feel that we have reached the limit in all of these areas....

For us the first result of the BIU value for 1969-70 was that we have had to budget for a deficit.... Too many commitments had been made to do otherwise. Thus, part of the effect will be felt only in 1970-71. Otherwise we found we had to absorb the effect by cutting in every aspect of the university's operations.... Most serious, our ratio of students to faculty members will be too large, and will result in many classes that are too big in size. This is indeed our greatest single worry. In these days of student concern about effective learning it was depressing that despite a good deal of ingenuity we will have some huge first year and even over-large second and third year classes.... in general the situation ... is that we shall have to be extremely tight in every direction, and the greatest danger is of student dissatisfaction.

PROJECTIONS OF ENROLMENT WITH FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS FOR 1970-71

In order to gain an overall perspective on the operating fund situation for 1970-71, various projections of possible levels of funding related to alternative enrolment possibilities were undertaken. Table 1 of Appendix A shows historical enrolments and grants since the inception of the formula system. This table indicates that over the three-year period total grants have increased by \$40 - \$50 million annually, although at a decreasing rate (31% for 1968-69, and 18% for 1969-70).

One might summarize the cumulative impact of these developments as follows:

FTE students have increased by 36%

Unit value has increased by 16%

Total grants have increased by 55%

These statistics make clear that the rapid growth of provincial government expenditure during this period has been primarily due to an increasing student population, with a lesser effect attributable to changes in unit value. The relative effects of these two factors are shown on a year-by-year basis in the section of Table 1 on Basic Operating Income, which reveals the decreasing contribution of increase in unit value to growth of basic operating income. Since fee levels have not changed substantially over the three years, income from fees has grown at a rate close to expansion of the student population, and thus has contributed a decreasing proportion of funds to the total cost of a university education.

Table 2 contains a series of hypothetical projections of enrolments and operating grants for 1970-71, with 1969-70 projections^{1/} as a base for comparison. We are aware that projection of enrolment for 1970-71 on the basis of reasonably firm data no later than 1968-69 is risky to say the least. Nevertheless, the desirability of having some early indication of likely levels has led us to extrapolate from past data to a projection for 1970-71 of 126,000 students, contributing a total of 217,000 units. To provide for a margin of error, we have also made projections at 120,000 and 132,000 students (approximately $\pm 5\%$). For the December submission, we will have anticipated actual enrolments for 1969-70 to enable us to refine these projections.

For each level of forecast enrolment, the impact on total grants of no increase, and increases of 5%, 10% and 15% are illustrated. It should be stressed that these hypothetical examples are given merely to place in perspective the overall financial context in which decisions about funding for 1970-71 will be made, and in particular to show the relation of total grants required to the variables of students (translated into units) and per-student expenditure (unit value). The value of the BIU without an increase, for instance, is shown as a baseline to illustrate that at the most likely level of enrolment, increased enrolment alone would account for a 15% increase in total grants required, with a 9% increase being required at a minimum enrolment level and a 19% increase at a maximum level. The highest estimate of this table, shown in the

^{1/} DUA compilations of university estimates.

column at the right, based on a maximum enrolment and a 15% increase in unit value, would require a 40% increase in total grants.

Examination of the Basic Operating Income section of the table reveals that the same relative effects noted in the historical table will pertain to 1970-71, namely that additional students will continue to play a major part in requirements for increments in funding. This table could of course be constructed for any set of values that one might choose to examine.

It is axiomatic that the major concern of the Ontario Government Treasury Board is the total amount of required grants. The major point revealed in the historical analysis is that the growth in the bill to the taxpayer for university education increasingly is being determined by the level of accessibility to university. Level of accessibility, in this sense, refers to the number of places made available, with the concomitants of low levels of fees and high levels of student support. With this commitment to maintaining the current level of accessibility, it is clear that requirements for university operating funds will continue to increase at a substantial rate.

INCREASES IN UNIVERSITY COSTS

For the past several months, we have been considering suggestions from the Chairman of the Committee on University Affairs and the Deputy Treasurer regarding development of Ontario university cost indexes similar to those used by the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals and the University Grants Commission in Great Britain.^{2/}

The basic limitation in the application of such an index system is that it must necessarily deal with past increments. Future unit cost increases may be more or less than in the past. Also, unit cost changes do not tell the whole story. Necessary increases in expenditures on various components from year to year may or may not coincide with index changes, which are solely measures of price. For example, an index of utility costs (heat, light, water, etc.) will not take into account needs for increased services occasioned by changes in physical plant. Changes in instructional methods will lead to altered requirements in types or quantities of equipment and supplies used in teaching. A cost index cannot reflect such changes.

Despite these limitations, indexes are of value and in its submissions to CUA in the past two years, CPUO has taken a modified approach with emphasis on shifts in patterns of fund allocations and analyses of internal tradeoffs as exemplified by degradation of staff/student ratios associated with necessary increases to teaching staff.

^{2/} Indexes are computed semiannually and cumulatively on a July 66 base for 13 components of operating costs based upon data collected from university, official, and private sources. Academic salaries and superannuation are treated separately in the computation of the index.

The UK index appears to be an ambitious and expensive undertaking. We do not see the necessity for maintaining such a detailed list of components at this time but would favour using external indicators along with the cost pattern analyses and the tradeoff features of our past submissions. Further, we would not like to see adjustments in unit value become a strict application of the index on the assumption that inflation is the guiding principle to the adjustment of government grants. This would simply serve to exert a static pressure on the university system which will hopefully be dynamically responsive to the needs of a changing society.

At this time we are in no better position to do precise university cost analysis than in the past. There are however external cost pressures that can be identified. It is convenient to relate these to university expenditures under the following headings:

Academic Salaries

Non-Academic Salaries

Academic Support and Administration

Library Professional

Library Other

Physical Plant

Pensions and Other Fringe Benefits

Library Books

Other Non-salary Expenses

Academic Salaries

Appendix B contains comparisons of academic salaries in various regions of Canada which were not available for last year's briefs.

These data indicate that in 1968-69, salaries in Ontario universities were at levels comparable to those in the rest of Canada, apart from the Maritimes. We will, of course, wish to maintain this relative position.

Actual increases in academic salaries in Ontario averaged slightly over 10% in 1969-70. Without committing the universities to salary policies in advance of the knowledge about what their income will be, we could use the increase of 1969-70 as a reference point, that is, 10%. Alternatively, the academic salary component could be given the value of OCUFA's salary objective for 1970-71, that is, 20%. The financial implications of this alternative are shown in Appendix C.

Academic Support and Administration Salaries

We know that 1969-70 increases to non-academic employees in some universities have been similar to academic increases; the average increase was in the neighbourhood of 8-9%. Also, according to a recent Bank of Nova Scotia newsletter, labour contract settlements other than construction provided for approximately 8% increases in wages in 1968 and there were continuing strong rises in wages and salaries during the first half of 1969. We would therefore use 8% as the value of the indicator for these costs.

Library Staff: Professional and Other

We have no separate indicators of salary trends for library staff. It would seem reasonable, however, to use the value ascribed to academic salaries for library professional staff and that ascribed to academic support and administration staff for library non-professional staff, that is 10% and 8% respectively.

Physical Plant Salaries

This category is a mixed one containing administrative and professional staff, workers in the trades, cleaners, security staff, etc., and it would be difficult to find a single external indicator to represent the entire category. It is clear however that there are strong pressures on wages for the trades: recent settlements with Toronto building trades unions (plumbers, sheet metal workers, concrete formers, carpenter, electricians, and painters) resulted in annual increases averaging 33%. It is inevitable that these Toronto settlements will be reflected in higher trades wages in other cities which will contribute to direct and indirect cost pushes in all physical plant wages and salaries. A figure of 10% would seem to represent an absolute minimum for average wage increases in physical plant.

Pensions and Other Fringe Benefits

This category includes fringe benefits of both academic and non-academic staff. It is difficult to obtain any precise external indicators of the total value of fringe benefits for comparison with those provided by the universities. Since the majority of fringe benefit expenditure applies to academic staff, we have adopted the value of academic staff increases for increases in this sector, that is, 10%.^{3/}

^{3/} This is likely conservative; fringe benefit payments as a percentage of total salaries increased by 13% (from 6.0% to 6.8%) in 1968-69 over 1967-68; comparisons to other jurisdictions and trends in other sectors of the economy suggest a need to maintain this increase.

Library Books

Various indexes of purchase cost of library materials are available. Over the past couple of years, cost indexes of U.S. and British materials in the categories of books, periodicals, and serials have risen between 6% and 13%^{4/}. These increases reflect a continuation of trends over the past 5-10 years and there is no indication of any deceleration. Since we do not have figures distributing library purchases over categories of materials or national sources, we have used these indexes merely as general guides, and have chosen 10% as a reasonable value for the present calculations.

Other Non-Salary Expense

This residual category is most heterogeneous, incorporating purchased supplies and equipment, contracted services, and such miscellaneous items as travel, insurance, etc. We have examined various DBS cost indexes to see whether any of these might be applicable to some of the components of this category. The industry selling price indexes, for instance, registered increases in various manufactured goods which differed significantly from one another depending on the industry in question; coke and gas products, for instance, were 0.4% higher in July 1969 than in July 1968, while electrical wires and cables were 8.3% higher. With such different price trends, and no data on the distribution of university purchases among types of goods and services, it seems impossible to apply such indexes. We have instead adopted 5% as a nominal value for increases in other non-salary expense.

^{4/} Sources: Bowker Annual 1969; Library Journal, July 1969; Library Association Record, August 1969. Also, the U.K. University Grant Commission index for books, periodicals, and bindings rose 21.6% in a two-year period 1966-68; in the last six months of this period the increase was 7.8% or an annual rise of 15.6%.

Recapitulation

We can now put this together into a table to show the minimum requirements in increased funds at current levels of workload if we accept that cost increases over the past year will continue through 1970-71.

	<u>% of Budget*</u>	<u>% Increase</u>	<u>Weighted % Increase</u>
Academic Salaries	42.4 [#]	10.0	4.24
Non-Academic Salaries	26.9		
Academic Support & Administration	16.6	8.0	1.33
Library Professional	1.6	10.0	.16
Library Other	2.7	8.0	.22
Physical Plant	6.0	10.0	.60
Pensions and Other Fringe Benefits	4.7	10.0	.47
Library Books	3.2	10.0	.32
Other Non-Salary Expense	<u>22.8</u>	5.0	<u>1.14</u>
TOTAL	100.0		8.48

*Based on UA-4 and UA-1 anticipated actual data for 1968-69 for the eight emerged universities.

#This 42.4% includes 4.1% part-time academic staff and 4.1% graduate student teaching staff; these categories of staff were included because no separate measures of cost changes were available. If we add an estimated 3.6% of the total 4.7% fringe benefits to the percentage for academic salaries, academic compensation accounted for 46% of the budgets of the emerged universities in 1968-69.

We may think of the cost of a student being composed of three components; base year cost of the student, annual adjustment factor for inflation and a factor for changes in the quality of education. With 16,000 more students expected in 1970-71 than in 1969-70, the increased expenditures required resulting from increased students

is \$44 million.^{5/} Total basic operating income will be about \$288 million in 1969-70 so the total increase in 1970-71 due to units alone will be about 15%. To this would have to be added an increase to meet increased university costs - about 8.5% if the current trend continues. This would add \$28 million^{6/} to the \$44 million equalling \$72 million.^{7/}

We have seen that increases to university costs in the past year have averaged close to 8.5%; the increase in 1970-71 is unknown at this time but there is no reason to expect that it will be less than 8.5%. A significant comparison can be made here with hospital costs; the Ontario Hospital Services Commission has indicated a willingness to accept an 8.5% increase in unit costs of hospital services (excluding new services) for the 1970 budget year.

Thus, a minimum of \$28 million is likely to be required to meet increased costs in 1970-71. If the increase to total basic operating income is less than \$72 million the quality factor is caused to become negative and the net result is an arbitrary reduction in average expenditure/student at the same time university enrolments and costs are going up. The summary of remarks by the presidents indicates that the universities would be hard pressed to adjust to another year of 5.5% increase in unit value and 8-10% increases in university costs.

^{5/} From Table 2.

^{6/} 217,000 units x 8.48% of \$1530

^{7/} Appendix C shows an alternative calculation using the OCUFA salary objective as the value of the academic salary increase.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1

ANALYSIS OF INCREASES TO OPERATING INCOME IN PROVINCIALLY-ASSISTED
UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO, 1967-68 THROUGH 1969-70*

ENROLMENT				
		1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
		ACTUAL	ESTIMATED ACTUAL	DUA PROJECTIONS
Students (FTE) ⁺		81,000	95,000	110,000
Increase	- No.		14,000	15,000
	- %		17.3%	15.8%
Basic Income Units		138,000	164,000	188,000
Increase	- No.		26,000	24,000
	- %		18.8%	14.6%
Units per Student		1.71	1.71	1.72

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS				
Unit Value Increase	- %		9.8%	5.5%
	- \$		\$ 130	\$ 80
Unit Value	- \$	\$1320	\$1450	\$1530
Basic Operating Income	- \$	\$182m	\$238m	\$288m
Increase	- \$		56m	50m
From Increased Units			34m	35m
From Increased Unit Value			22m	15m
Increase	- %		30.8%	21.0%
Standard Fees [#]	- \$	\$ 38m	\$ 46m	\$ 53m
Increase	- \$		8m	7m
	- %		21.0%	15.2%
Formula Grants	- \$	\$144m	\$192m	\$235m
Increase	- \$		48m	43m
	- %		33.3%	22.4%
Special Grants	- \$	\$ 20m	\$ 23m	\$ 19m
Increase	- \$		3m	- 4m
	- %		15.0%	-17.4%
Total Grants	- \$	\$164m	\$215m	\$254m
Increase	- \$		51m	39m
	- %		31.1%	18.1%

*Source: B. L. Hansen, "Brief of the Structure and Operation of the Operating Grants Formula for the Provincially-Assisted Universities of Ontario, 1967-68 through 1969-70", July 24, 1969.

⁺The figures for FTE students are a result of adding full-time equivalents of part-time students' to full-time enrolments. For instance, in 1968-69 there were approximately 82,000 full-time students and 57,000 part-time students converting to 13,000 full-time equivalents, for an FTE total of 95,000. The historical statistics and projections shown here will not correspond with those contained in Ontario University and College Enrolment Projections to 1981-82 (1968 Projection), Cicely Watson and Saeed Quazi, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Enrolment Projections 4, 1969. The latter include full-time students only, and incorporate students in theological colleges and other non-provincially-assisted institutions.

[#]Fees per student assumed at \$470 for 1967-68, \$483 for 1968-69, and \$485 for 1969-70.

TABLE 2

PROJECTIONS OF OPERATING GRANTS TO PROVINCIALY-ASSISTED UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO FOR 1970-71

		Forecasts of Enrolment for 1970-71									
		1969-70 Projection	Minimum			Most Likely			Maximum		
Students (FTE) Increase	- No. -	110,000 15,000 15.8%	120,000 10,000 9.1%			126,000 16,000 14.5%			132,000 22,000 20.0%		
	- No. -	188,000 24,000 14.6%	206,000 18,000 9.6%			217,000 29,000 15.4%			227,000 39,000 20.7%		
Basic Income Units*											
Increase	- No. -										
	- No. -										
Financial Implications of Alternative Increases in Unit Value for 1970-71											
1969-70 Projection		5.5% \$ 80 1530	0% \$ 0 1530	5% \$ 77 1607	10% \$ 153 1683	15% \$ 230 1760	0% \$ 0 1530	5% \$ 77 1607	10% \$ 153 1683	15% \$ 230 1760	
Unit Value Increase	- \$ -										
	- \$ -										
Unit Value											
Basic Operating Income Increase	- \$ -	\$288m 50m 35m 15m 21.0%	\$315m 27m 27m 0m 9.4%	\$331m 43m 27m 16m 14.9%	\$347m 59m 27m 32m 20.5%	\$363m 75m 27m 48m 26.0%	\$332m 44m 44m 0m 15.3%	\$349m 61m 44m 17m 21.2%	\$365m 77m 44m 33m 26.7%	\$382m 94m 44m 50m 32.6%	\$400m 112m 59m 53m 38.9%
	- \$ -										
Formula Grants [#] Increase		\$235m 43m 22.4%	\$257m 22m 9.4%	\$273m 38m 16.2%	\$289m 54m 23.0%	\$305m 70m 29.8%	\$271m 36m 15.3%	\$288m 53m 22.6%	\$304m 69m 29.4%	\$321m 86m 36.6%	\$336m 101m 43.0%
Total Grants ⁺ Increase	- \$ -	\$254m 39m 18.1%	\$277m 23m 9.1%	\$293m 39m 15.4%	\$309m 55m 21.7%	\$325m 71m 28.0%	\$291m 37m 14.6%	\$308m 54m 21.3%	\$324m 70m 27.6%	\$341m 87m 34.3%	\$356m 102m 40.2%
	- \$ -										

*Assuming an income unit per student ratio of 1.72

[#]Basic operating income less standard fees, assumed at \$485 per student⁺Formula grants plus special grants (including computer grants), estimated at \$19m for 1969-70 and \$20m for 1970-71

APPENDIX B

COMPARISON OF SALARY LEVELS AT CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

The data analysed here are derived from the annual DBS survey of academic salaries, as published by the CAUT in the spring of each year. For this analysis, the data on individual institutions were summarized into four geographic regions: Atlantic Provinces, Quebec, Ontario (provincially-assisted universities only), and Western Provinces. Instructors and Visiting Professors were excluded because of lack of uniformity in applying these classifications. Further, since some institutions do not report chairmen of departments separately, chairmen were grouped with full professors.

Table 3 shows average salaries (all ranks) for each region from 1966-67 to 1968-69. Over the three-year period, salaries in Ontario have improved relative to the Canadian average, from a level close to the average in 1966-67 to about 2.7% better than the average in 1968-69. In the latter year, Ontario salaries were the highest of any region, followed by the Western provinces at 1.4% less, Quebec at 4.1% less, with the Atlantic Provinces trailing at 15.6% less than Ontario.

In an attempt to improve the meaningfulness of comparison of salary rates, we examined the possibility that these averages might be affected by differences in proportions of staff at various ranks. Table 4 shows percentage rank distributions by region for 1968-69. It is clear that there are differences which will introduce biases into regional averages. For instance, Ontario has a higher percentage of full professors and chairmen than the average for Canada, and the Atlantic provinces a lower than average percentage. We therefore recalculated the data of Table 3, adjusting

other regions to the same rank distribution as Ontario. The result is shown in Table 5. While the overall trends are similar to those shown by unadjusted averages, the magnitude of the differences between regions is reduced. In 1968-69, Ontario has an average only 1.5% higher than the adjusted Canadian average, with the adjusted figures for the Western Provinces at 0.9% less, Quebec at 1.7% less, and the Atlantic Provinces at 10.0% less than Ontario. An overview of this table reveals that salaries in Ontario have improved in relative position over the three-year period, to reach a level just slightly above those in the Western Provinces. Quebec has followed closely. Although salaries in the Atlantic Provinces have increased at about the same rate as those in Ontario, they still lag substantially behind the other regions of Canada.

Table 6 presents a comparison of salaries in various regions for 1968-69 by rank. Salary rates in Ontario are close to those for Quebec and the Western Provinces for all ranks except for full professors and chairmen, where the average is 3.4% higher than the Western Provinces and 6.7% higher than Quebec.

Overall, it appears then that average academic salaries in Ontario for 1968-69 were at levels comparable to those in the rest of Canada, apart from the Maritimes.

TABLE 3

UNADJUSTED AVERAGE ACADEMIC SALARIES IN CANADA, 1966-67 TO 1968-69*

	1966-67	1967-68		1968-69		CUMULATIVE % INCREASE
	<u>AVERAGE SALARY</u>	<u>AVERAGE SALARY</u>	<u>% INCREASE</u>	<u>AVERAGE SALARY</u>	<u>% INCREASE</u>	
Atlantic Provinces	10,112	10,849	7.3%	11,504	6.0%	13.8%
Quebec	11,099	12,262	10.5%	13,066	6.6%	17.7%
Ontario	11,470	12,622	10.0%	13,630	8.0%	18.8%
Western Provinces	11,773	12,681	7.7%	13,440	6.0%	14.2%
CANADA	11,431	12,432	8.8%	13,275	6.8%	16.1%

*Source: CAUT Bulletins, February 1967, February 1968, February 1969; Visiting Professors and Instructors have been excluded because of lack of uniformity in applying these classifications.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE RANK DISTRIBUTIONS OF ACADEMIC STAFF IN CANADA, 1968-69*

	<u>FULL PROFESSOR AND DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMAN</u>	<u>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</u>	<u>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR</u>	<u>LECTURER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Atlantic Provinces	14.7 (199)	22.3 (302)	42.5 (576)	20.5 (278)	100.0 (1351)
Quebec	18.4 (499)	25.9 (705)	40.5 (1101)	15.2 (414)	100.0 (2719)
Ontario	22.0 (1327)	27.6 (1666)	36.5 (2206)	13.9 (839)	100.0 (6038)
Western Provinces	18.6 (925)	30.3 (1506)	42.1 (2092)	9.0 (449)	100.0 (4972)
CANADA	19.6 (2950)	27.7 (4179)	39.6 (5975)	13.1 (1980)	100.0 (15084)

*Source: CAUT Bulletin, February 1969; Visiting Professors and Instructors have been excluded because of lack of uniformity in applying these classifications.

TABLE 5

ADJUSTED AVERAGE ACADEMIC SALARIES IN CANADA, 1966-67 TO 1968-69*

	1966-67	1967-68		1968-69		CUMULATIVE % INCREASE
	<u>AVERAGE SALARY</u>	<u>AVERAGE SALARY</u>	<u>INCREASE</u>	<u>AVERAGE SALARY</u>	<u>% INCREASE</u>	
Atlantic Provinces	10,369	11,393	9.9%	12,264	7.6%	18.3%
Quebec	11,454	12,488	9.0%	13,398	7.3%	17.0%
Ontario	11,470	12,622	10.0%	13,630	8.0%	18.8%
Western Provinces	11,910	12,708	6.7%	13,511	6.3%	13.4%
CANADA	11,545	12,526	8.5%	13,426	7.2%	16.3%

*Source: CAUT Bulletins, February 1967, February 1968, February 1969; Visiting Professors and Instructors have been excluded because of lack of uniformity in applying these classifications. Averages for regions other than Ontario have been adjusted to distributions in academic rank comparable to those of Ontario in each year.

TABLE 6

ACADEMIC SALARIES IN CANADA BY RANK, 1968-69*

	<u>FULL PROFESSOR AND DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMAN</u>	<u>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</u>	<u>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR</u>	<u>LECTURER</u>	<u>UNADJUSTED AVERAGE</u>	<u>ADJUSTED AVERAGE</u>	<u>#</u>
Atlantic Provinces	\$17,061	12,952	10,329	8,387	11,504	12,264	
Quebec	18,291	14,328	11,384	9,095	13,066	13,398	
Ontario	19,615	14,271	11,288	9,049	13,630	13,630	618
Western Provinces	18,963	14,472	11,197	9,049	13,440	13,511	
CANADA	19,014	14,258	11,181	8,966	13,275	13,426	

*Source: CAUT Bulletin, February 1969; Visiting Professors and Instructors have been excluded because of lack of uniformity in applying these classifications.

#Averages for regions other than Ontario have been adjusted to distributions in academic rank comparable to Ontario.

APPENDIX C

ALTERNATIVE PROJECTION OF INCREASES IN UNIVERSITY COSTS FOR 1970-71

For this alternative projection of the calculations on pages 15-16, we have employed the OCUFA salary objective of 20% average increment for 1970-71 as the value of the academic salary component. The calculations are altered as follows:

	<u>Original Projection</u>	<u>Alternative Projection</u>
% Increase in Academic Salaries	10.0%	20.0%
Weighted % Increase in Academic Salaries	4.24%	8.48%
Weighted % Increase in Pensions & Other Fringe Benefits*	.47%	.83%
Total % Increase in University Costs	8.48%	13.08%
Total Increase for Increased Costs	\$28m	\$43m
Total Increase to Basic Operating Income	\$72m	\$87m

This alternative projection thus adds \$15 million to total basic operating income, for a total of \$87 million.

*Estimated for Alternative Projection

COMMITTEE ON UNIVETSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

OF OPEN MEETING

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held
on 20th October, 1969, in the Senate Chamber,
R. D. Parker Building, Laurentian University,
at 9:15 a.m.

Minute
1582

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright	Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur	
Dr. R. Gerstein	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.	
Dr. J. G. Parr	
Dr. R. J. Rossiter	
Dr. D. W. Slater	

Mr. H. A. Cotnam
Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. E. E. Stewart	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. J. S. Bancroft	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	

LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY DELEGATION

Administration

Mr. S. G. Mullins, President
Dr. R. J. Clotier, Vice-President
Mr. C. Nurmi, Comptroller
Mr. J. R. Harrison, Director of Physical Plant and
Planning

Senate

Dean G. Vallillee, Faculty of Arts and Science
Dean J. Dewar, Division of Physical and Health Education
Dr. W. Y. Watson, School of Graduate Studies
Dr. A. S. Tombalakian, (Proposed) School of Engineering

Board of Governors

Mr. W. J. Shea, Q.C., Chairman
Mr. D. J. Caswell, Chairman of Executive Committee
Mr. L. T. Lane, Chairman of Physical Plant and Planning
Commission
Mr. W. B. Plaunt, Vice-President of Board

Faculty

Professor G. J. Clarke, President, Faculty Association
Dr. D. H. Williamson, Head, Department of Geology
Dr. E. Wright, Head, Department of Engineering
Professor W. R. Cook, Department of Economics

Observers

Professor V. diNorcia
Dr. R. H. Farrant
Professor A. C. Ashby
Professor D. Hilldrup

Students

Mr. P. Fortin, President, Students General Association
Mr. D. Los, Vice-President, Students General Association
Mr. R. Chartrand, Member, Students General Association
Mr. S. Alexander, Member, Students General Association

1583 LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY PRESENTATION

The formal presentation of Laurentian University to the Committee on University Affairs, as contained in the bound brief dated 20th October, 1969, was presented as follows:

Introduction by Mr. W. J. Shea, Chairman of the
Board of Governors

Presentation by Mr. S. G. Mullins, President

Brief of the Faculty Association, read by
Professor G. J. Clarke

Brief of the Students General Association, read by
Mr. P. Fortin

The following points were included in the general discussion which followed the formal presentation.

Dr. Wright explained briefly the background upon which the Committee on University Affairs had developed a basis for its planning. He explained that they were trying to develop notions of objective standards and to evolve a framework upon which as much as possible of the discussions and the decisions within the universities could be focussed. He emphasized that the recommendations of the Committee had been based on global amounts for both capital and operating funds each year on the understanding that each university would allocate its own resources within the institution according to its own priorities. He recognized that there was a continuing problem of the disparity between aspirations and the availability of funds. As a result, decisions concerning the allocation of funds always involved trade-offs and, therefore, required full consideration

by all segments of the academic community.

Dr. Wright acknowledged Laurentian University's sense of responsibility for meeting the needs of the region in which it is located, but pointed out that unlimited expansion could not be supported without regard to costs. Thus new programs within the University had to be shown to be practicable. As examples, he suggested that their arguments for the establishment of Faculties of Engineering and Law could be considered to be quite logical from the point of view of meeting regional needs, but it had to be shown that a viable enrolment could be achieved before any positive decision could be reached. He requested the University to develop a comprehensive brief concerning Law and Engineering, a brief which included the total requirements for development of these faculties, including that of the Library.

Referring to the comments which had been made concerning the confusion of the role of the Committee and of the Department of University Affairs, Dr. Wright referred to the reports of the Committee on University Affairs and of the Department of University Affairs, each of which contained a description of their work and responsibilities.

With reference to the request for assistance in founding research institutes, it was pointed out that the funding of the Department of University Affairs was focussed on support for students. No special support had been provided, nor recommended by the Committee, for research institutes per se since it was felt that these should be funded through other agencies, including the operating divisions of Government who have specific interests and needs for research in their particular areas. Mr. Stewart explained that the Provincial Government was trying to clarify the inter-relationship of various Government departments with respect to research, and explained that it was generally understood that research supported by Provincial Government departments should be mission oriented. During the discussion which ensued, the need for co-ordination of support for research and the co-ordination of research activities among universities was mentioned.

The comments of the Faculty Association concerning the development of graduate programs was noted with special interest by the Committee. One member commented upon the fact that the four graduate programs approved first for Laurentian University were those in which there was not the greatest demand for enrolment. There followed some general comments on the problem of re-allocation of priorities in the face of trends in enrolment, particularly with respect to programs in Social Sciences, Humanities, and Pure Sciences.

The different points of view reflected in the three separate reports were noted by the Committee. It was recognized that the introduction of these reports reflected the development of processes of consultation within the institution and the Committee on University Affairs encouraged further open discussions of this type as a means of arriving at effective solutions which would reflect most effectively the interests and needs of all segments of the academic community.

President Mullins emphasized that, as long as dining and campus centre facilities formed a part of the formula, emerging universities faced an accentuated problem since the cost of these represented an inordinate share of the capital funds available for total development. He suggested that imbalances of this nature made the problem of emerging institutions more acute than those faced by older, larger universities. The Chairman suggested that this problem was being considered in the development of a capital formula. He indicated that it might prove possible in future to provide funds for special function space of this nature on the basis of needs which have been projected farther into the future than for other facilities. The importance of seeking every alternative available and every possible method of making the best use of the facilities was stressed at some length. Also emphasized by the Committee was the importance of developing a capital formula which would leave the decision concerning priorities of building within the hands of the university.

With respect to enrolment, it was noted that the projection submitted by the University represented a 25 per cent increase over that submitted the previous year. The President suggested that this increase came as a result of an analysis made by the University and represented the greater drawing power of the University. He indicated, as well, in response to a request from the Chairman, that the University could provide the Committee with summaries of the geographic distribution of the students presently attending Laurentian University. He mentioned that the enrolment projections anticipated an eventual distribution of enrolment in which some 40 per cent of the total would be represented by students from Southern Ontario.

LUNCHEON

1584 ALGOMA COLLEGE BRIEF

The following representatives of Algoma College met with the Committee for this portion of the meeting:

Dr. E. Brown, Principal
Mr. J. M. Cameron, Vice-Chairman of the Board
Mr. E. L. Hollingsworth, Member, Board of Governors
Mr. H. Macdonald, Registrar.

In addition, President Mullins, Mr. Nurmi and Mr. Shea represented Laurentian University.

Principal Brown presented the Algoma College brief dated 20th October, 1969, copies of which were distributed to the members of the Committee.

Following the formal presentation, Dr. Brown stressed the need for a solution to the problem of land acquisition on the site to be shared with Cambrian College. He emphasized that the Department of Education would not permit payment of the asking price for this land, since it appeared to be too high, nor would they give permission to Cambrian College to expropriate the property. He explained, as well, that the other property which Cambrian was attempting to acquire was under litigation and might not be available for some time. After some discussion on this topic, Mr. Stewart promised to take up with the Minister the problem of acquiring the 25 acre site.

Dr. Wright indicated that the Committee recognized the need for a detailed study of capital requirements in order to arrive at a valid recommendation of the level of capital support which would be adequate. The fact that Algoma College was undertaking some detailed planning, including the development of enrolment projections, was noted.

It was suggested that, since the development of permanent facilities on the Cambrian site could not be undertaken for at least two years, Algoma College should prepare recommendations for a short-term solution of their space and facilities problems.

1585 NIPISSING COLLEGE

Nipissing College was represented by Dr. G. J. Zytaruk, Principal; Mr. J. W. Trusler, Chairman of the Board of Governors; and Mr. R. F. Donnelly, Treasurer, Board of Governors.

President Mullins, Mr. Shea, and Mr. Nurmi represented Laurentian University.

Mr. Trusler reported a slow but steady growth of Nipissing College and emphasized the importance of the development of the College Education Centre. He stated that site services were under way on the new campus for this centre, and that they hoped to be able to begin construction by the Summer of 1970. He emphasized, however, that one of the main concerns facing Nipissing College is the manner in which this unique complex would be administered. He suggested that a form of administration was required which would join the two institutions, Cambrian College and Nipissing College, but leave

each one free to conduct its own specialized programs. Because of the difficulties being faced in developing such a unique structure, Mr. Trusler requested the assistance of all interested parties, including the Department of University Affairs and the Committee on University Affairs.

Principal Zytaruk presented the formal report of Nipissing College, copies of which were distributed to members of the Committee. He, too, emphasized the need for a co-ordinated development and requested the support of the Department of University Affairs in the discussions which were under way with Cambrian College and the Department of Education. He suggested that the development could be looked upon as a four-way co-operative venture, comprising Nipissing, North Bay Teachers' College, Cambrian College, and the School of Nursing, or that it could develop with two groups, Nipissing College, including the Teachers' College; and Cambrian College including the School of Nursing; who developed two separate administrations but shared certain joint facilities. He reiterated the special plea which Nipissing wished to make for being allowed to take over the North Bay Teachers' College.

In response to the request for assistance from the Department of University Affairs in the negotiations with the Department of Education, Mr. Stewart indicated that he would arrange to have a representative of the Department of University Affairs present at future meetings. He suggested, however, that mere representation by the Department of University Affairs would not provide the final solution. He noted that the styles of administration of the two Government Departments were different and that perhaps the Commission on Post-Secondary Education might be the avenue through which a solution could be achieved to the types of problems being faced in this situation. He mentioned, as well, that facilities for Teachers' Colleges no longer were going to be built by the Department of Public Works, since these institutions were being absorbed by the universities throughout the Province.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

.....
Chairman.

.....
Secretary.

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of Open Meeting of the Committee
held on Tuesday, 21st October, 1969, in
the Board Room of the Department of Uni-
versity Affairs at 10:00 a.m.

Minute

1586 PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright Chairman
The Honourable Leslie M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.
Dr. R. Gerstein
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes
Dr. M. J. Lavigne
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.
Dr. J. G. Parr
Dr. R. J. Rossiter
Dr. D. W. Slater

Mr. H. A. Cotnam
Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. E. E. Stewart Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon
Mr. J. S. Bancroft

1587 LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY BRIEF

The Committee welcomed the delegation from Lakehead Univer-
sity consisting of the following:

Dr. W. G. Tamblyn, President
Mr. G. Thompson, Comptroller
Mr. H. Parker, Executive Assistant to the President.

Dr. Tamblyn summarized each section of the Lakehead Univer-
sity brief, which had been distributed to members of the
Committee.

The following represents some of the points which were raised
in the ensuing discussion.

An exchange of views took place concerning the problems of
curricular changes, particularly in science, and their effect
on the choice made by students. It was noted that, although
the enrolment for 1969-70 as reported in this brief was a
little lower than that which had been projected, the five-
year projection showed an increase of 20 per cent over the
projection submitted in the fall of 1968. Dr. Tamblyn

indicated that, in the opinion of university officials, the decrease in the current year did not represent a trend and that, as a result, he did not feel that the latest enrolment projections necessarily would be out of line. He did, however, indicate that the University would have to revise its estimates in the light of the current year's experience, since these projections were made prior to receipt of fall term enrolment data.

Dr. Tamblyn reported that it was not possible to examine the needs for 1970-71 for the Faculty of Education, since the University still had not finalized the budget for the 1969-70 fiscal year. During the ensuing discussion it was agreed that consideration would have to be given at a later date to provisions for Education in the new fiscal year after the subcommittee chaired by Dr. Slater had had an opportunity to present a report on grant support for teacher education programs.

During the general discussion of capital requirements the Committee noted Dr. Tamblyn's point that the problems of emergence, with associated problems of "block" building in small institutions, had led to Lakehead's disregarding the figures from the interim capital formula. As a result, the Committee requested the University to substantiate its proposal with information showing the standards upon which the University had based its planning.

The open meeting ended at 12:20 p.m.

1588 SUBCOMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The Committee concurred with the suggestion of the Chairman that Dr. Gerstein be named Chairman of the Subcommittee on Graduate Studies and Research and that Dr. Parr be included as a member of that subcommittee.

1589 GRANTS-IN-AID OF RESEARCH

Dr. Wright reported that no increase in the total money available for Grants-in-Aid of Research could be anticipated for the 1970-71 year. He indicated that several suggestions had been received concerning administration of this program, including the suggestion to broaden the scope of the program to include social science. In keeping with this suggestion, and in view of the fact that there appeared to be little hope of increasing the total amount of money available for this purpose, he suggested that consideration be given to restricting grants to "new" faculty members; that is to say, either individuals who were undertaking their first year of appointment in Canada or those who were within three years of having received their doctoral degrees. In addition, he suggested

that all grants be given to projects which are of direct interest to the Province of Ontario.

During the discussion which followed, it was noted that a provincial committee had been established to correlate programs of support by various provincial government departments and agencies. It was suggested that, if possible, no final decision be made concerning the Department of University Affairs program of Grants-in-Aid of Research until after that committee had reported. In the interim, however, it was also agreed that the subcommittee should discuss the administration of the Grants-in-Aid of Research program with the Department of University Affairs.

Dr. Lavigne reminded the Committee that no action had been taken to publish the names of the grant recipients along with the titles of their research projects. Mr. Stewart undertook, on behalf of the Department, to prepare such a listing for general distribution.

1590 ONTARIO GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

Dr. Wright reported that a letter had been received from the Committee of Presidents concerning Ontario Graduate Fellowships. It was agreed that the recommendations contained in this letter should be examined by the Subcommittee on Graduate Studies and Research in conjunction with a review and re-assessment of the terms, objectives, and nature of this program of support. The Subcommittee was requested to report back to the Committee with specific recommendations on this topic.

1591 COUNTING NEW PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Dr. Wright reported that further examination of the average weighting of programs in Arts and Science at the University of Toronto had revealed that a weighting of 1.20 was appropriate. He referred to a memorandum from Mr. Bancroft to this effect, a copy of which is attached to the minutes as an addendum.

1592 REVIEW OF PROGRAMS AND SUBJECTS FOR STUDY

The Chairman indicated that a general view was required of both the programs of support, and policies relating to these, in respect of grants to universities in Ontario. He suggested that the Committee should review its terms of reference in order to determine that these were being served adequately and that attention should be given to those general issues which require further study.

Dean Parr suggested that a survey on enrolment in the physical and applied sciences was required. He suggested, further, that attention be given to the development of library facilities

since there had been evidence in the past of the Committee of Librarians' failure to recognize the changing nature of data collection and to adjust their plans and procedures accordingly. The Chairman agreed to enquire through the CPUO of the state of affairs of development of library facilities in the Province. It was agreed that further consideration should be given to this topic early in the new year.

It was suggested that a longer term schedule be developed for meetings of the Committee in order to allow for discussion of those topics which were of a more general nature than was permitted within the current series of meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

.....
Chairman.

.....
Secretary.

Memorandum for:

Mr. E. E. Stewart,
Deputy Minister.

Re: Average Weighting to Apply in 1969-70
for New Programmes in Arts and Science
at the University of Toronto.

You will recall that at the most recent C.U.A. meeting a decision as to whether an average weighting of 1.20 or 1.21 ought to be used was deferred pending a review of actual average weightings in 1967-68 and 1968-69 carried to at least three decimal places (it was considered inappropriate to use projected data for 1969-70).

This review has been carried out and the following conclusions arrived at based upon weightings of 1.1889 for 1967-68 and 1.1929 for 1968-69:

- (i) Rounding of 1968-69 weighting to three figures gives 1.20.
- (ii) The difference (.007) between the average weighting in 1967-68 and 1968-69, used to extrapolate to 1969-70, gives $1.1929 + .007 = 1.2029$ i.e. to three figures, 1.20 again.

Thus, it can be seen that the two choices which were open to the Committee, that is using a 1968-69 "actual" or a 1969-70 "extrapolated" weighting, gives the same result, 1.20.

Since the next C.U.A. meeting is to be held very soon it perhaps would be wise to ratify, at that time, this weighting before the decision is communicated to the University.

JSS/MSH

J.S. Bancroft
Director of Finance

16th October, 1969.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, PROJECTED * 1969-70 FORMULA DATA, ARTS AND SCIENCE

(with comparative data 1967-68 and 1963-69)

	<u>ARTS</u>			<u>SCIENCE</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>		
	Students	B.I.U.	Average Weight	Students	B.I.U.	Average Weight	Students	B.I.U.	Average Weight 1969-70 1968-69 1967-68 Projected Actual
Full-Time General	2,925.0	2,925.0		1,112.0	1,112.0		4,037.0	4,037	
Honours (Upper Years)	<u>2,036.0</u>	<u>3,054.0</u>		<u>953.0</u>	<u>1,906.0</u>		<u>2,989.0</u>	<u>4,960</u>	
Total Full-Time	4,961.0	5,979.0	1.21	2,065.0	3,018.0	1.46	7,026.0	8,997	1.23 1.24 1.25
Make-up	<u>360.0</u>	<u>535.0</u>		<u>205.0</u>	<u>370.0</u>		<u>565.0</u>	<u>905</u>	
Excluding Make-up	4,601.0	5,444.0	<u>1.18</u>	1,860.0	2,648.0	<u>1.42</u>	6,461.0	8,092	<u>1.25</u> <u>1.24</u> <u>1.22</u>
Part-Time Equivalent	<u>1,399.2</u>	<u>1,416.7</u>	1.01	<u>78.3</u>	<u>98.3</u>	1.26	<u>1,477.5</u>	<u>1,515</u>	1.03 1.03 1.03
Part-Time and Full-Time Excluding Make-up	6,000.2	6,860.7	1.14	1,938.3	2,746.3	1.42	7,938.5	9,607	1.21 1.20 1.19
Make-up	<u>360.0</u>	<u>535.0</u>	1.49	<u>205.0</u>	<u>370.0</u>	1.80	<u>565.0</u>	<u>905</u>	1.60 1.59 1.65
Full-Time and Part-Time Including Make-up	6,360.2	7,395.7	<u>1.16</u>	2,143.3	3,116.3	<u>1.45</u>	8,503.5	10,512	<u>1.24</u> <u>1.22</u> <u>1.22</u>

* Submitted prior to implementation of New Programme.

Finance Branch

Revised
9/30/69

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held
on Monday, 3rd November, 1969, in the Collins
Room, Richardson Hall, Queen's University at
9:15 a.m.

Minute
1593

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright	Chairman
Mr. M. E. Arthur	
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.	
Dr. R. Gerstein	
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.	
Dr. J. G. Parr	

Mr. H. A. Cotnam
Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. E. E. Stewart	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. J. S. Bancroft	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY DELEGATION

Mr. J. D. Gibson, Chairman, Board of Trustees
Dr. J. J. Deutsch, Principal
Mr. H. G. Conn, Vice-Principal (Administration)
Mr. L. G. Macpherson, Vice-Principal (Finance)
Dr. E. H. Botterell, Vice-Principal (Health Sciences)
and Dean, Faculty of Medicine
Dr. J. H. Brown, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science
Professor R. J. Hand, Dean, School of Business
Dr. E. Jean Hill, Dean, School of Nursing
Professor W. Peruniak, Assistant Dean, McArthur College
of Education
Dr. B. L. Adell, Assistant Dean, Faculty of Law
Dr. R. L. Watts, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science
Mr. T. D. Phillips, Assistant Chief Librarian

Members of the Senate Committee on Academic Development

Dr. A. J. Coleman, Department of Mathematics
Dr. H. M. Estall, Department of Philosophy
Professor H. V. Fullerton, School of Business
Professor R. J. Kennedy, Associate Dean, School of
Graduate Studies

Dr. D. A. Rosen, Department of Ophthalmology
Professor H. R. S. Ryan, Faculty of Law

Professor G. A. Andrews, Campus Planner
Mr. B. Trotter, Head, Academic Planning

Students

Mr. W. Myles
Mrs. C. Paynter
Mr. B. Scully

1594 QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY BRIEF

Dr. Deutsch referred to the statement prepared for the Committee on University Affairs and to the supporting documents, all of which had been distributed prior to the meeting. He indicated that the enrolment growth at Queen's University was slowing down and that it would be devoted in future to rounding programs for which the University had already committed itself or which were already in existence. Stating that the growth in enrolment at Queen's would be approximately half of that of the provincial average, Dr. Deutsch stressed that the operating grants formula favoured rapidly growing institutions. Referring to this item in the brief, he indicated that enough allowance had not been made for increase in costs in a university which had a slow pattern of growth. He expressed the concern of Queen's University lest they be faced with a deterioration of quality which he said would ensue in the face of the need to adapt to the constantly changing demands being made upon the University.

Dr. Deutsch mentioned the impact of the University on the community, and the problems which arose as a result. He welcomed the news of the proposal to make provincial grants to the city in lieu of taxes and described, as well, some of the problems relating to the scarcity of housing accommodation for students within the community.

With respect to physical planning, Dr. Deutsch noted that the introduction of an interim capital formula required a major shift in the approach to planning. He suggested that existing inventories, established on the basis of the project approach for each building, fitted badly when taken on an overall basis, particularly in an institution such as Queen's where many old buildings existed which were not easily adaptable. He suggested that some form of transition period from the one type of planning to the other should be allowed, particularly when the facilities problem was accentuated by the shift in enrolment to areas such as the social and life sciences. He expressed the hope that some relief would soon be forthcoming on the freeze on funds for renovations.

The question of the overlapping of some facilities for medical sciences with that of the physical sciences was raised as well. University representatives asked whether these should come under the new interim formula of the University or whether the health sciences development fund should be expected to carry the burden for shared facilities.

In addition, Dr. Deutsch asked for, and received, a clear indication that capital facilities financed by the University itself would not be counted in the inventory. It was noted that further attention would have to be given to the problem created in allocating inventory for buildings where some of the financing came from private sources.

Among the other areas requiring attention, Dr. Deutsch indicated that the weighting of general and honours programs in arts and science was one of concern to Queen's University. He reported that the bachelor of social work program had not been implemented since the University did not find it possible to finance the fourth year field work on the basis of the formula system. It was suggested further that the formula for nursing and for law should be revised and that formula support specifically should be provided for computing services.

Dr. Deutsch indicated the University looked forward to the integration of McArthur College into the formula grants system.

Some discussion was held concerning the application of the formula to interdisciplinary programs and the hope was expressed that, in view of the increasing importance of these programs, the formula system would not inhibit their development.

In response to these observations, Dr. Wright recognized the needs which were outlined by the University and indicated that the Committee on University Affairs had been attempting to provide support on an objective basis through the policies for grant support which were being developed. He indicated that it appeared that the government would be hard pressed to maintain the standards and the levels of support in the immediate future and suggested that the possibility of increasing these levels was unlikely. He emphasized that the interim capital formula was recognized as a device to be employed during a period of transition and that the needs and problems outlined by the University would have to be accommodated within the final structure of the formula. In view of the restricted funds available, however, he emphasized as well the need to develop facilities which are easily adapted to changing needs.

Dr. Wright reminded the University that a choice between alternatives in both capital and operating must rest with the

University. He explained that the anticipated review of the operating grants formula had been delayed somewhat by the realization that the AUCC cost study would not be forthcoming. *AP* He indicated that this analysis would now have to be completed, within Ontario, and indicated that, when it had been completed, the formula weights would be reviewed.

The problem relating to the development of the new mining building was discussed at some length. Mr. Stewart pointed out that many other buildings in Ontario universities were in the same category as the mining building; that is, plans for their development had begun prior to the introduction of the interim capital formula. He suggested that if such buildings were handled outside of the formula at this stage, the whole principle of formula financing would be undermined. In response to Dr. Gerstein's question concerning the ways in which the University could develop innovative processes which would replace rather than add on to the existing structure, particularly in relation to such areas as social work, teaching, and medicine, Dr. Botterell reviewed the community programs being developed by Queen's medical students and the faculty. In addition, the field work programs relating to social work were discussed at some length.

Dr. Deutsch suggested that the inventory for some of the old buildings might be arbitrarily reduced in order to handle the problem of out-of-date facilities. He stressed the importance of the University retaining flexibility in its decisions to renovate or to demolish out-of-date structures. He suggested, as well, that money be allocated for "cheap space" and that the University be allowed to use it as it sees fit. In this way there would be an incentive to profit from being economical.

Some general discussion ensued concerning the problems being faced by the students in their attempts to obtain financing for co-operative residences.* The University officials lauded the initiative which students had shown in this area and indicated their hope that the impression created on officials of CMHC as a result of the Rochdale experience would not prove to be detrimental to the development at Queen's.

Officials of the University indicated that salaries at Queen's were not competitive at the senior level when attempts were made to recruit outstanding staff members.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

* See Appendix A

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY AT KINGSTON

REPORT

ON

STUDENT HOUSING NEEDS TO 1975

Prepared by the University Campus Planner

October, 1969

Report on Student Housing Needs to 1975

INTRODUCTION

A recent survey of Queen's students living off-campus in 1969, the analysis of which is still proceeding, provides a valid sample of the basic characteristics of those students and their off-campus housing.

The total full-time enrolment in 1968/69 was 6,765 students of which 2,225 lived on campus in University residences, the remaining 4,540 students living off-campus in private accommodation including their normal homes. It is estimated that 510 students were resident at home or with relatives and therefore about 4,000 full-time students lived off-campus, not at home with relatives.

The survey in 1969 confirmed an earlier estimate by the Department of Physical Plant that about 80% of the 4,000 students mentioned previously lived within one mile of the Main Campus. 66% of the students living off-campus walked to the University, 25% travelled by car and only 5% lived beyond the city boundaries and, consequently, beyond the ambit of public transit.

The amount and type of accommodation occupied by the off-campus students ranges from 68% in houses and apartments, to 27% in rooms and 5% in motels/hotels. The proportion in houses and apartments is naturally high, since about 25% of these students are married, but the fact remains that 2 out of 3 single students living off-campus do so in houses and apartments.

The survey indicates a considerable degree of sharing of accommodation which leads to the conclusion that single students rent nearly as many apartments as single rooms. This is not surprising in view of the limited number of rooms regularly available from year to year, and it is reasonable to conclude that the additional single students living off-campus each year rent apartments and houses in competition with other prospective tenants from the community at large. The economic effects have been publicised by pressure groups but as the single students do not rent more than 15% of all apartments available in the City of Kingston, they cannot be regarded as the sole cause of a lack of community housing which is a local, provincial and federal problem!

Quite clearly if this situation continued without the University and government agencies actively developing student housing to supplement the market in such a small city as Kingston, widespread community dissatisfaction would intensify. It is within this context that the University's housing needs are examined, as well as in relation to prospective academic development.

ENROLMENT AND HOUSING NEEDS

1. The following revised statement on student housing needs has been prepared as a supplement to the Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Development, September 1969, related to growth of full-time enrolment to 10,000 students by 1975-76.
2. The enrolment data shown in Table A, attached, upon which the assessment of housing needs is based, was extracted from Table 1 of the Table of Projections, Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Development, September, 1969.
3. The appended Tables A, B and C provide an estimate of the increase in numbers of single and married students who would not otherwise normally reside in Kingston during the period 1969 to 1975.
4. Alternative cumulative increases in numbers of single and married students seeking housing in addition to those presently housed in Kingston, commencing both in 1968 and 1969, conclude Table C.
5. It is not clear to what extent students were inadequately housed for the year 1968-69 and therefore it is reasonable to assume that Table C provides a guide to the selection of minimum residence construction targets in order to meet the increase in student numbers beyond the existing enrolment.

- 4.
6. Therefore, the range of total residence needs for 1975 is estimated to be at least 1000 to 1400 single student units and 450 to 600 married student apartments, in addition to the present and planned provision by the University of 2900 single student units and 260 married student apartments and the use of private housing by the remainder, about 4500 students.
 7. Site availability, architectural design criteria and financial support continue to present major problems for future residential development. Since 1968 a new element in the supply of housing has been the growth of interest in co-operative student action. Science '44 Co-operative has increased the number of student-beds from 70 in 1968 to 20 in 1969 and the Alma Mater Society has made detailed plans for a co-operative residence to house 400 single and married students about 3/4 mile from the Main Campus but lack of available finance via C.M.H.C. has delayed construction this year.
 8. The rising interest rates of C.M.H.C. mortgage finance and the foreshadowed cut-back in expenditure by the Federal Government indicate difficulties ahead in the preparation of accurate plans for housing development based upon the use of federal-provincial finance.
 9. If at least the extent of new government loans per annum for Queen's University student housing is maintained at 1968-1969 levels, approximately \$3 million might be borrowed each year. The best use of these funds can be

made if residence sites can be purchased prior to their development by the University with funds from the Capital Aid Corporation as in the past.

10. If the latter budgetary situation prevails it may be possible to programme the construction of the equivalent of 330 single student units and 100 married student apartments each year, commencing 1970-71, thereby at least maintaining the status-quo concerning use of the existing community housing stock by students and eventually improving the overall situation. It is of interest that the ability of the students to pay for such new accommodation will be tested during the next few years when projects currently under development are completed. The Sub-Committee on Student Residences Planning is particularly concerned about the need for a study of financial and corporate business techniques which may be suitable for the development of different forms of housing.
11. In the opinion of the Sub-Committee on Student Residences Planning suitable residence sites available for immediate development are so scarce that the West Campus presents the only real opportunity for large-scale development by 1971-72. The number of students to be accommodated will be determined by the availability of finance and the types of units required, i.e. single/married/apartment/other. The Sub-Committee agrees that some single graduate students and childless married

5.

students be housed on the West Campus in apartments. The Sub-Committee is divided in its opinion on the desirability of housing single, undergraduate students on the West Campus, but, recognising the immediate needs for housing, concludes that there is no alternative open at this time other than providing apartments on this site.

12. The latter suggestions are considered valid in relation to objectives of university development despite some misgivings about early residential development on the West Campus. The lack of new academic building projects with which residences might be linked in the immediate future near the Main Campus, the impending improvement of recreational and social facilities on the West Campus and the introduction of a new bus service this October to link downtown, the Main Campus, the West Campus and the married student housing project near Calvin Park are factors affecting judgement on this issue.
13. In the longer term it may be possible for the University to develop sites for the proposed Urban Renewal Scheme, Sydenham Ward, together with sites in proximity to the new Earl Street residence and in the Portsmouth area, thus satisfying the bulk of remaining needs for single and married students while also contributing to the desired goals of the City of Kingston presently being expressed in discussions of the City of Kingston Planning Board.

14. Of particular concern at present is the fact that first year undergraduate enrolment might increase by 250 students by 1975, most of which will be seeking residential accommodation near the Main Campus. It might be especially important to develop immediately a residence suitable for about 60 students similar to the new Earl Street residence. The 47 Wellington Street site is most appropriate for such development if clearance can be obtained from the City of Kingston. An immediate need is to house women students in a similar fashion to that adopted for the Earl Street site, i.e. until needs change and alternative student residents can be specified.

CONCLUSION

The need for additional student housing to accommodate between 1000 to 1400 students is clearly established for the period 1970-1975.

The cost of such housing, spread over five years, can be met with the present level of borrowing from government sources for Queen's University student housing if sites can be acquired beforehand.

The ability of students to pay for such housing has yet to be tested!

The location of student housing sites suitable for linkage to the West Campus and Main Campus are not numerous but there are real prospects for development

of the necessary housing in order that the University might grow to the size desired for proper academic achievement.



Professor G. Andrews
University Campus Planner

2nd October 1969

hw

1969 HOUSING REPORT - TABLE A - ENROLLMENT TO 1975-76

Category	Actual			Projected			
	68/69	69/70	70/71	71/72	72/73	73/74	74/75
Undergraduate	5914	6392	7061	7261	7534	8035	8184
Graduate	851	1023	1180	1385	1503	1610	1720
Total Full-Time	6765	7415	8241	8646	9037	9646	9904
							10,110
Category and % Resident at Home							
Undergrad. 8% to 12%	480	550	650	720	790	890	950
Grad. 4% to 6%	30	40	50	60	70	80	90
Total Full-Time 7 1/2% to 11%	510	600	700	780	860	970	1040
							1100
Category Seeking Residence							
Undergraduate	5434	5832	6411	6541	6744	7146	7234
Graduate	821	983	1130	1325	1433	1530	1630
Total Full-Time	6255	6815	7541	7866	8177	8676	8864
							9010
Category and Annual Increase in those Seeking Residence							
Undergraduate	398	579	579	130	203	402	88
Graduate	162	147	147	195	108	97	100
Total - Full-Time	560	726	726	325	311	499	188
							146

1969 HOUSING REPORT - TABLE B - MARITAL STATUS OF ANNUAL INCREMENTS IN STUDENTS SEEKING RESIDENCE

S = Single M = Married

PROJECTED

CATEGORY	68/69 to 69/70	69/70 to 70/71	70/71 to 71/72	71/72 to 72/73	72/73 to 73/74	73/74 to 74/75	74/75 to 75/76
UNDERGRADUATE	398	579	130	203	402	88	46
(MARRIED: 10% to 12%)	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M
	358 40	519 60	117 13	181 22	358 44	78 10	40 6
GRADUATE	162	147	195	108	97	100	100
(MARRIED: 55% to 60%)	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M
	73 89	65 82	84 111	45 63	40 57	40 60	40 60
TOTAL ANNUAL INCREASE	560	726	325	311	499	188	146
	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M
	431 129	584 142	201 124	226 85	398 101	118 70	80 66
TOTAL CUMULATIVE INCREASE	560	1286	1611	1922	2421	2609	2755
	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M	S M
	431 129	1015 271	1216 395	1442 480	1840 581	1958 651	2038 717

1969 HOUSING REPORT - TABLE A ANNUAL INCREMENTS IN STUDENTS
SEEKING RESIDENCE TO 1975/76, INCLUDING MARITAL STATUS,
ADJUSTED FOR PLANNED AND CONSTRUCTED PROJECTS TO 1970

S = Single

M = Married

PROJECTED

CATEGORY	68/69 to 69/70	69/70 to 70/71	70/71 to 71/72	71/72 to 72/73	72/73 to 73/74	73/74 to 74/75	74/75 to 75/76
TOTAL ANNUAL INCREASE	560	726	325	311	499	188	146
FULL-TIME (from TABLE B)	S M 431 129	S M 584 142	S M 201 124	S M 226 85	S M 393 101	S M 118 70	S M 80 66
LESS PLANNED AND CONSTRUCTED RESIDENCES	276 S M 96 180	656 S M 576 80					
ADJUSTED TOTAL ANNUAL INCREASE	284 S M 335 -51	70 S M 8 62	325 S M 201 124	311 S M 226 85	499 S M 398 101	188 S M 118 70	146 S M 80 66
ADJUSTED CUMULATIVE INCREASE	284 S M 335 -51	354 S M 343 11	679 S M 544 135	990 S M 770 220	1489 S M 1168 323	1677 S M 1286 393	1823 S M 1366 459
ADJUSTED CUMULATIVE INCREASE		70 S M 8 62	395 S M 209 186	706 S M 435 271	1205 S M 833 372	1393 S M 951 442	1539 S M 1031 506

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held
on Monday, 3rd November, 1969, in the Collins
Room of Richardson Hall, Queen's University
at 2:00 p.m.

Minute
1595

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.
Dr. R. Gerstein
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes
Dr. M. J. Lavigne
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.
Dr. J. G. Parr
Dr. D. W. Slater

Mr. H. A. Cotnam
Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. E. E. Stewart Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon
Mr. J. S. Bancroft
Mr. J. D. McCullough

University of Ottawa Delegation

Dr. R. Guindon, O.M.I., Rector
Dr. J. Grace, Member, Board of Governors
Mr. R. N. Seguin, Member, Board of Governors
Mr. A. K. Gillmore, Vice-Rector (Administration)
Dr. M. Chagnon, Vice-Rector (Academic)
Dr. M. Beznak, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Medicine
Dr. L. Dayhaw, Vice-Dean, Psychology
Dr. L. Desjarlais, Dean, Faculty of Education
Mr. J. G. Debanne, Dean, Management Sciences
Dr. P. Hagen, Dean, School of Graduate Studies
Mr. G. Amyot, Registrar
Mr. W. B. Boss, Director of Public Relations
Dr. F. Bernier, Director, Department of Music
Dr. P. Morand, Assistant Vice-Rector, Academic Planning
Dr. G. Rondeau, Director, Linguistic and Modern Languages
Mr. J. McCarthy, Assistant Vice-Rector (Administration)
Mr. W. Kubasiewicz, Director, Architectural Planning

1596

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA BRIEF

The Rector of the University of Ottawa, Father Guindon, commented briefly on the material contained in the brief which had been distributed to members of the Committee in advance

of the meeting. He indicated that the University was proud of its record of bilingualism and, in response to a question, reported that 32 per cent in 1965-66 and 30 per cent in 1968-69 of the students came from the Province of Quebec. Of these, 60 per cent had indicated that it was the bilingual nature of the University which attracted them.

Father Guindon reported that the University was considering dropping the pre-university year since students in Ontario can now take instruction up to and including grade 13 in French. He indicated that no quotas had been established on linguistic or cultural grounds for admission to the University; instead, he said, the University was anxious to continue to use strictly academic bases for admission. The University had experienced some pressure to become unilingual but had resisted this in order to avoid the competition which makes one group attempt to dominate the other. He suggested that the values of a bilingual institution were as great to an English-speaking student as they were to a French-speaking person.

Reporting that 20 per cent of students had come from homes where the total annual income was less than \$5,000, Father Guindon cited, as one of the principal causes, the proportion of French-speaking students who were enrolled. He suggested that, in relative terms, French-speaking people represented a lower income group than did the English-speaking Canadians.

Commenting on the shortage of some 200 students in second year Arts from that projected by the University, Father Guindon explained that the University had no way of anticipating the number of students who would come from the CEGEP's into second year. In addition, he explained that there was little flexibility in some programs because of the limitations of space.

Speaking of capital grants, Father Guindon recommended that the allowance for part-time students should be revised in calculating the capital grants formula. During the general discussion which followed, Professor Morand indicated that, although they had begun by using the formula categories suggested, in the end they felt that these required some alteration, particularly in the areas such as law and education. It was for this reason that the figures cited by the University in this area differed from those provided by the interim formula. It was suggested that, as well, space entitlements should be provided on a total basis in order to allow flexibility within the University.

With respect to land acquisition, Mr. Gillmore reported that 80 per cent of the proposed site had been acquired. He

explained that the University had altered its policy to acquire only those properties which were actually needed for site development, plus those which were offered at a reasonable price. The University recognized that this method was more expensive than would be the acquisition of the total properties required as soon as possible, but recognized the limitation of funds available for this purpose. Mr. McCarthy asked whether there would be any objections to the University's borrowing to finance purchase of property and whether the Government would pay the carrying charges. No specific reply was given beyond acknowledging that the University had actually made financial arrangements of this kind already.

During the general discussion the need for communication of the role actually being carried out by the universities and their effectiveness in using resources was emphasized. In this connection, the Chairman noted the progress which had been made in improving productivity through co-ordinated effort, both internally at the University of Ottawa and with Carleton University.

The discussion included a brief review of the establishment of the Ontario Health Resources Development Fund and the response which the University was making to the need for health sciences in its planning of future development.

The need for student facilities, particularly residence facilities, was stressed. It was reported that only 8 per cent of the students could be accommodated in residence and that, although two residences were being built, there was no adequate provision for providing meals for non-residents. In addition, other facilities, such as those provided in a campus centre, were urgently required.

The meeting adjourned at 4: 15 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held
on Tuesday, 4th November, 1969, in the Collins
Room of Richardson Hall, Queen's University at
9:15 a.m.

Minute
1597

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright	Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur	
Dr. R. Gerstein	
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.	
Dr. J. G. Parr	
Dr. D. W. Slater	

Mr. H. A. Cotnam
Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. E. E. Stewart	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. J. S. Bancroft	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	

Trent University Representatives

Mr. H. F. Waddell, Chairman, Board of Governors
Professor T. H. B. Symons, President and Vice-Chancellor
Professor R. H. Sadleir, Vice-President
Mr. B. D. Sandwell, Member, Board of Governors
Mr. T. J. Bata, Member, Board of Governors
Dr. G. D. W. Cameron, Member, Board of Governors
Dr. E. A. Forsey, Member, Board of Governors
Mr. G. Weeks, Administrative Assistant to the President
Professor W. P. Adams, Chairman, Department of Geography
Professor W. Dray, Chairman, Department of Philosophy
Professor M. Kitchen, Department of Economics
Mr. A. O. C. Cole, Registrar
Mr. J. M. Kennaley, Financial Planning Officer
Professor T. E. W. Nind, Director, Faculty of Arts
and Science
Mr. J. E. Leishman, Comptroller
Professor C. Carter, President, Association of Teaching
Staff
Mr. J. G. English, Director of Information
Mr. A. E. Parker, University Engineer
Mr. J. Butcher (Student), President, Champlain College
Cabinet
Mr. W. Dines, Undergraduate Representative on the
Budget Committee

Mr. J. Thorp, Undergraduate Representative on the
Budget Committee

1598

TRENT UNIVERSITY BRIEF

President Symons summarized briefly the main points contained in the brief to the Committee on University Affairs. He distributed, as well, a two-page summary of specific recommendations as contained in that brief.

Dr. Wright complimented Trent on the progress which had been made in planning and in adjusting to the conditions imposed by the availability of resources for development. Dean Nind spoke at some length concerning the proposed 1.2 weighting for Arts and Science at the University of Toronto which he anticipated might become the standard for all of Ontario. He pointed out that the University of Toronto was not satisfied with its own program when the cost study was initiated and that graduate programs had absorbed many of the costs which normally might be associated with an undergraduate faculty. He suggested, therefore, that a university which did not have graduate studies was at a real disadvantage, particularly if it attempted to provide funds for faculty research. He supported strongly the suggestion that a figure of 1.5 would be a reasonable minimum average weighting for an institution. Speaking further of the operating formula, Dean Nind suggested that the current weighting made no allowance for fixed costs and pointed out that many of these costs were related to numbers of students, not to the types of programs in which these students were enrolled.

Referring to emergent grants, Dean Nind pointed out that one other university with much larger enrolment than Trent was still receiving a special grant of 60 per cent and thus Trent assumed that they would qualify for a like amount. He pointed out that Trent did not wish to compromise its academic philosophy or its policies by increasing unduly the rate of enrolment. He suggested that the faculty was working at capacity with an average of 11.7 contact hours and a staff-student ratio of 1/13.2. He indicated that it would be impossible to increase the ratio to 1/15 without becoming second-rate, and appealed to the Committee on University Affairs for understanding on the basis that the Trent "experiment" had anticipated the trend in Arts and Science education by several years, as was evidenced by the Hall-Dennis Report and the Macpherson Report. He suggested that it would be most unfortunate if this experiment were to be allowed to fail.

Mr. Leishman presented the request to phase out the use of Rubidge Hall and to attempt to arrange for its sale. He reported, as well, that the University was developing a consortium with the Ontario Student Housing Corporation, the University architect, and a contractor for the construction

of residences in a manner unique to Ontario. He asked, as well, for an indication of the possible scope of development of capital facilities during the next two or three years.

During a wide-ranging discussion concerning the pattern of development of Trent University in the unique manner described by the University officials, the necessity of achieving full-scale operation without the benefit of extraordinary support was stressed. Professor Nind indicated that he felt that Trent could "emerge" in five years if an average weight of 1.5 were granted as a base as requested in the brief, but that this emergence could not be achieved on a base weight of 1.2 without destroying the concept of the University. The question was also asked whether, with the personalized approach being taken by the University, more favourable retention rates than those indicated in the data submitted by Trent could not be achieved than those experienced by institutions where students do not receive a comparable amount of personal attention.

A supplementary statement was presented by Professor Carter on behalf of the Association of Teaching Staff. Copies of this statement were distributed to the members of the Committee.*

Returning to the problems related to capital construction, Dr. Wright emphasized the need for developing flexible space which could be adapted for various purposes. He urged consideration of adopting a system similar to that employed by the SEF System in Toronto. Further general comments were made concerning the proposal to abandon Rubidge Hall, but it was pointed out that such a move would be dependent on overall capital priorities.

Mr. Bata spoke of the successful capital fund campaign which had been undertaken, giving credit to the unique Trent system which had made people in business and industry receptive to requests for financial assistance of this nature. He noted, as well, that the question of student unrest received the most attention from major donors.

President Symons reported on the establishment of an Alumni Association at Trent University and invited a recent graduate of the University to speak on this aspect of the University's development.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

* See Appendix A

TRENT UNIVERSITY PETERBOROUGH ONTARIO CANADA

TRENT UNIVERSITY ASSOCIATION OF TEACHING STAFF

Statement to the Committee of University Affairs
Concerning the University's Budget Submission -
November 4, 1969.

.....

The Faculty Association shares the concern of the Budget Committee about the financial situation of Trent University. In fact, we believe that the University has already been forced to accept, and is further proposing, 'Economies' which are harmful and dangerous.

Teaching loads of some Faculty members already exceed 20 formal student contact hours per week. This does not include the many hours of preparation, marking, and informal contact which are an essential part of the Trent method of teaching. The desirability of increased teacher/student contact at the undergraduate level has been consistently advocated on pedagogical grounds, e.g. in the McPherson Report at the University of Toronto, but it cannot be implemented with student/faculty ratios much greater than 10:1. Teaching loads at Trent are already too high to be consistent with high quality instruction, and we suggest that the faculty and students of Trent University are unlikely to accept, without considerable and deep-seated reservations, the projected increases in student/faculty ratios contained in the University's brief.

We are also deeply concerned about the resources and time available for faculty research. An active research programme is an essential and integral part of a University's activities, and the absence of a large graduate programme makes it even more important to provide extra resources and time for faculty research. The 1967 report of the Committee

of University Affairs recognised that '...Academic staff in the newer universities should have effective opportunities for scholarship and research ...' (p.25), but the present financing formula appears to make no direct provision for this need. In the United Kingdom, the Robbins Committee on higher education reported in 1963 that the average student/faculty ratio was 7.6, and should be maintained or improved to permit universities to remain as integrated research-teaching institutions. (Paras. 69, 526-7)

The present financing formula in Ontario is completely inadequate for the needs of the smaller universities, particularly where experimental teaching methods are being used. We believe that the Trent Experiment is worthwhile and is being watched with interest by many in the University Community. But we can succeed only if the financing formula is radically changed.

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday, 4th November, 1969, with Carleton University, in the Collins Room of Richardson Hall, Queen's University commencing at 1:30 p.m.

Minute
1599

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright	Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur	
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.	
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.	
Dr. J. G. Parr	
Dr. D. W. Slater	

Mr. H. A. Cotnam
Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. E. E. Stewart	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. J. S. Bancroft	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	

Carleton University Delegation

Dr. A. D. Dunton, President
Professor H. H. J. Nesbitt, Dean, Faculty of Science
Professor J. Ruptash, Dean, Graduate Studies
Professor G. C. Merrill, Dean, Faculty of Arts
Professor D. A. George, Dean of Engineering
Professor J. J. Kelly, Dean, St. Patrick's College
Division, Faculty of Arts
Mr. A. T. Tolley, Associate Dean, Faculty of Arts
Professor G. R. Love, Director of Planning
Professor B. A. McFarlane, Department of Sociology
Dr. J. A. Webb, Department of Biology
Mr. J. I. Jackson, Registrar
Professor D. Shadbolt, Director, School of Architecture
Professor S. Bowers, Director, School of Social Work
Mr. A. LaRose, Bursar
Mr. J. E. Whenham, Director, Planning and Construction
Mr. V. A. Wehrle, Student Representative

1600

CARLETON UNIVERSITY BRIEF

Dr. Dunton introduced members of his delegation and summarized briefly the major points outlined in the brief. He emphasized particularly the effect of the large increase in enrolment which had gone beyond the prediction of the University and which, in the opinion of the University, would have a major effect on future development. He suggested that there might be a need to curtail enrolment in the future on a modest scale, in order to accommodate the development of universities within the confines of available financial resources. Dr. Wright suggested that perhaps there were other alternatives to restricting enrolment in the face of limited funds and suggested that the universities might not have exploited all other possibilities for adapting to the changing situation thus far.

During the general discussion which followed, Dr. Dunton noted, in reply to a question from Dr. Slater that, although the University had no figures available, he felt the Ontario Student Awards Program had had a significant influence on enrolment, particularly on many part-time students who, with the help of this program, now found it possible to enrol as full-time students. Dr. Dunton noted that, even though a greater proportion of students appeared to be succeeding in grade 13, students in university were also being more successful as reflected by the reduction in university failure rates in the last year or two.

With respect to the operating grants formula Dr. Dunton indicated that he supported the formula system but opposed the differential in the weighting of general and honours students in Arts and Science. He indicated that Carleton could operate on the basis of the proposed weighting of 1.2 for Arts and Science students under the existing formula. Dean Nesbitt explained, however, that Carleton was not typical by virtue of the number of part-time faculty within the community upon which the University could draw for assistance and that, consequently, other universities might not find it possible to operate with equal success on that level of support.

Referring to capital funding, Dr. Wright noted that the surging enrolment had helped to soften the problem of capital needs. He acknowledged again that while the interim formula did not make allowances for the part-time enrolment factor, the final disposition would take this into account. Professor Love, referring to this section of the brief, emphasized that the interim formula was too low in his estimation by approximately 7 to 10 per cent, primarily because of the effect of heavy part-time enrolment. Dr. Wright noted that more work needed to be done on this aspect of the capital formula. He suggested that the analysis which had been done by Carleton University should be forwarded through Mr. Hedden to the Joint Capital Studies Committee since it had relevance for all the universities.

With respect to the base inventory, Dr. Dunton indicated that they felt the inclusion of the total space at St. Patrick's College imposed some hardship. He suggested that the block of unusable space at St. Patrick's be deleted from the inventory or, preferably, that the amount of government financial assistance for the purchase and renovation of St. Patrick's be divided by \$55 in order to arrive at an allocation of a reasonable area which could be included in the inventory. He indicated that it was extremely difficult to use very old buildings of this nature efficiently because of their basic structural formation. Dr. Slater indicated that this was one example of a problem which was shared by a number of other universities and that the solution arrived at by the Joint Capital Studies Committee should allow for all problems of this nature. Mr. Stewart indicated that there was one other factor in this case which needed to be borne in mind; namely, that Carleton had absorbed St. Patrick's into its structure without being in any position to influence the type or nature of the space which had been provided there previously. Because of this, he suggested that the inventory of space at Carleton should not suffer for that reason alone.

There followed further discussion on non-assignable capital projects and a statement by Professor Shadbolt of the need for providing a new building for architecture by the fall of 1971.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Long-Term

Selected Enrolment Data

1971-72 to 1975-76

1969-70 (Estimate)		1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
2500	(i) Full-Time "Freshman Intake" (i.e. 1st Year Undergraduate Degree)	2985	3210	3435	3615	3795
6530	(ii) Total Full-Time Undergraduate (including diploma and other non-degree and make-up or qualifying year)	8205	8980	9770	10460	11165
625	(iii) Total Graduate (Fall-Term)	800	895	980	1080	1165
7155	(iv) Total Full-Time Enrolment (ii plus iii)	9005	9875	10750	11540	12330
1680	(v) F.T.E. of Part-Time Enrolment (using Formula Conversion Factors)	2185	2395	2585	2745	2900
8835	(vi) F.T.E. Enrolment (iv plus v)	11190	12270	13335	14285	15230
12195	(vii) Total Basic Income Units Under Formula (i.e. Total Weighted Enrolment)	15415	16930	18410	19790	21125

Explanatory Comments outlining variations in above enrolment data as compared with similar forecasts submitted Fall, 1968 (Please deal with both the quantitative parameters of these variations and the reasons for them):

In 1968 we projected that in the fall of 1969 our First Year enrolment would be 2100, an increase of 12.5%. Instead, it has turned out to be 2435, an increase of 32%.

We had estimated that the total full-time enrolment this fall would be 6535, an increase of 10% over the 1968 level. It has turned out to be 7140, an increase of 19.5%.

This has caused us to revise our enrolment projections upwards since an increase above the 1968 projections are now built in by this year's First Year enrolment.

In the new projections we have used increases in future First Year enrolments above the actual 1969 level that seem reasonable in relation to our projections of Grade 13 enrolments in the Ottawa area.

It has not so far been possible to do a detailed analysis of the new First Year students to throw light on the reasons for the quite unexpected and extremely high increase in First Year enrolment. Early impressions are that the increase is largely in out-of-town students from other parts of Ontario, together with some increase in the proportion of Ottawa area students coming to Carleton.

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held
on Monday, 17th November, 1969, with The Uni-
versity of Western Ontario, at London, commenc-
ing at 9:15 a.m.

Minute

1601 PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright	Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur	
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.	
Dr. J. G. Parr	
Dr. D. W. Slater	
Mr. H. A. Cotnam	
Mr. J. C. Yen	
Mr. E. E. Stewart	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. J. S. Bancroft	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	

The University of Western Ontario Delegation

Mr. A. E. Shepherd, Chairman, Board of Governors
Capt. J. Jeffery, Vice-Chairman, Board of Governors
Dr. D. C. Williams, President
Mr. J. W. Adams, Chairman, Property Committee,
Board of Governors
Mr. J. A. Taylor, Chairman, Finance Committee,
Board of Governors
Mr. O. H. Warwick, Vice-President
Mr. R. B. Willis, Vice-President
Dr. H. B. Stewart, Chairman, Budget and Finance
Committee of Senate
Dr. J. A. F. Stevenson, Chairman, Senate Committee
on University Development
Mr. R. R. Glover, Comptroller
Dr. W. J. McClelland, Associate Dean, Faculty of
Graduate Studies
Dr. G. L. Reuber, Dean, Faculty of Social Science
Dr. J. G. Rowe, Dean, Faculty of Arts

Dr. A. E. Scott, Dean, Faculty of Science
Mr. J. Shortreed, Director of Physical Plant
Dr. E. Stabler, Dean, Althouse College of Education
Dr. J. H. Blackwell, Committee on Operational
Planning
Dr. P. D. Fleck, Chairman, Senate Committee on
Admissions and Academic Programs
Policy
Dr. P. A. Forsyth, Committee on Operational Planning
Dr. W. C. Howell, Committee on Operational Planning
Mr. M. Alexander, Graduate Student and Member,
Committee on Operational Planning
Mr. I. Brooks, Undergraduate Student and Member,
Committee on Operational Planning
Dr. J. J. Wettlaufer, Dean, School of Business
Administration
Dr. J. K. Watson, Registrar and Secretary of the
Senate
Mr. I. Thompson, Committee of Presidents of Univer-
sities of Ontario.
Dr. N. L. Nicholson, Committee on Operational
Planning
Dr. V. W. Sim, Committee on Operational Planning

1602 THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO BRIEF

Mr. Shepherd, Chairman of the Board of Governors, welcomed the Committee to the campus of The University of Western Ontario and asked Dr. Williams to present the University's brief.

In presenting the submission Dr. Williams explained the method by which the Committee on Operational Planning undertook its work and the basis upon which the report was prepared.

Professor Stewart, commenting on the section entitled, "Enrolment Forecasts", drew attention to the fact that projections of future enrolment had changed from the previous year, increasing by 56 per cent at the undergraduate level and decreasing by 3.6 per cent at the graduate level. He explained that these figures were derived on the assumption that there would be no restriction on enrolment and that the University would admit its full "share" of available candidates. During the discussion which followed, Dr. Wright questioned the reasoning behind the anticipation at this time of such an explosive rate of growth in enrolment; a rate which would exceed that of any other university in Ontario and most universities in the Western Hemisphere. Dr. Williams replied that this forecast represented an indication of what could happen and that the University was as concerned about this possibility as anyone else. He emphasized that no final

decision had been made to grow at this rate but that, instead, the forecast showed what could occur unless some direction were given or decision made to curtail such development.

In response to Dr. Wright's question concerning the apparent change in policy, whereby the University was asking to be advised of the rate of growth for which they should plan, Mr. Shepherd replied that it was their opinion that they did not have complete control over Western's development if other universities failed to grow sufficiently to absorb the demand for places within the next few years.

When it became apparent that the enrolment projection did not represent Western's preferred pattern of growth, Dr. Wright requested that a revised submission be made showing the growth pattern which the University officials regarded as appropriate.

Professor Fleck spoke briefly on the section entitled, "Proposed New Academic Programs 1970-75", indicating that these plans took into account enrolment and facility requirements. Dr. Wright indicated that, while no formal appraisal system existed for undergraduate programs, the policy of the Minister was to require notice of intent. The Minister reserved the right to withhold support for new programs which, in his opinion, do not warrant development.

Professor Stevenson emphasized the need for physical facilities, as outlined in the section entitled, "Space and Building Development 1970-76".

Dr. Wright acknowledged that the University had presented its plans on the basis of the interim capital formula and that as yet it was impossible to know whether this formula represented valid standards for space utilization. He asked whether, in recognizing that Western's current 85 assignable square feet per basic space unit truly represented "an intolerable burden on the University", as had been suggested, or whether it was proof that the interim capital formula is too generous. He asked if Professor Stevenson could describe how the academic functions of the University were being hindered and explained that his request was based primarily upon the wish to emphasize that the interim formula of 95 square feet was still open to question.

When he was informed that Western does have available spectra of utilization for the University, he requested that Mr. J.D. McCullough, Director of Architectural Services of the Department of University Affairs, take up this matter with university officials since it was most important to have available

all possible comprehensive results of experience.

Speaking of the costs of capital construction, Dr. Wright indicated that he could see no prospect for the provision of provincial support at the levels anticipated in Western's proposals. Mr. Stewart explained that, ultimately, the final criteria would be the dollars available for building purposes. He indicated that if the University were to build at costs above those provided for in the formula, it would be unable to provide adequate accommodation to meet the agreed upon space requirements. Conversely, if the University could build economically, it would be in a position to enjoy the benefits of additional space beyond that provided for in the formula.

Professor Slater asked about the interrelationships of space requirements and formula for health sciences and those of the University in general. Professor Stevenson indicated that basic space was shared insofar as possible and recognized that this factor needed to be taken into account, with allowances made for individual institutional differences. He suggested, as well, that some leeway needed to be given while the University was expanding its enrolment to reach its total capacity.

Dr. Wright noted that not much comment had been made in the brief concerning operating grants and requested that some elaboration of this feature be provided. Professor Stewart, Chairman of the Senate Budget and Finance Committee, explained that his Committee had attempted to introduce stability by establishing a cushion of 3 per cent of the total budget. In 1969-70, he indicated the overrun would lead to approximately \$2.2 million in excess of expenditures but that there were areas such as the School of Library Science, administrative offices such as that of the Registrar, and others which would absorb this excess. Dr. Wright asked whether this surplus exhibited a capacity on the part of the University to absorb additional enrolment without additional cost or whether it represented a time lag in expenditures. Professor Stevenson suggested that it was possible with the surging enrolment to get people to put up with temporary restrictions in equipment and accommodation but that ultimately relief had to be provided or else degeneration of efficiency and of standards would ensue.

Mr. Willis, speaking of 1970-71, indicated that, on the basis of enrolment forecasts and salary requests for faculty and supporting staff, without an increase in the basic income unit the University would have an additional \$700,000 to meet non-salary costs and that with a 5 per cent increase in basic income unit it would have only \$1,700,000 for this purpose.

Mr. I. Brooks, President of the Student Council, expressed concern that space be provided within the university system for all qualified applicants in Ontario. Speaking of the University Community Centre, he reported that the students were attempting to raise funds by assessing each student a fee of \$10 and that they are preparing to have a fund raising campaign for this purpose.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

.....
Chairman.

.....
Secretary.

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Monday, 17th November, 1969, with the University of Windsor, in Room 110, School of Business, The University of Western Ontario commencing at 2:00 p.m.

Minute
1603

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes
Dr. M. J. Lavigne
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.
Dr. R. J. Rossiter
Dr. D. W. Slater

Mr. H. A. Cotnam
Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. E. E. Stewart Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon
Mr. J. S. Bancroft
Mr. J. D. McCullough

University of Windsor Delegation

Dr. G. M. Morton, Chairman, Board of Governors
Dr. J. F. Leddy, President
Mr. W. L. McGregor, Member, Board of Governors
Mr. W. D. Howison, Member, Board of Governors
Mr. W. A. Cowan, Member, Board of Governors
Dr. F. A. DeMarco, Vice-President
Mr. W. R. Mitchell, Vice-President (Administration)
Mr. W. A. Marshall, Director of Institutional Research
Professor A. Gynp, President, Faculty Association
Mr. R. Baksi, President, Students Council

1604 UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR BRIEF

After performing introductions, Dr. Leddy explained that the current brief was essentially a progress report. Referring to his letter to Mr. Stewart of 16th October, as contained in the brief, he reported that, with respect to the Faculty of Education, a draft agreement had been prepared for consideration by the Department of Education. He explained that the Teachers' College was eager to join the University of Windsor and that no trouble was anticipated beyond the problem that was shared by all universities by the apparent failure of the Department of Education to recognize the need

to sort out the Provincial picture with respect to teacher education.

Dr. Leddy indicated hope that the new building for the Law Faculty would be completed by 1st May, 1970, and stressed the need for special support for the Law Library. Speaking of general development of the University, and referring again to his letter, he stressed the importance of developing graduate studies in order to provide more graduates who could be employed as faculty members within the Ontario system. Referring to future plans, Dr. Leddy expressed the desire of the University to provide the locale for the next medical school in the Province. He suggested that it was just a matter now of formal entry in the University's submission since, in the opinion of officials of the University, Windsor was the logical place for establishment of the next health sciences centre.

He questioned whether the University would be required to curtail development in view of its problems concerning land acquisition within the urban community. He suggested that if Windsor and other universities were required to level off a new university would need to be established and that planning for such an institution should be undertaken immediately.

During the general discussion which followed, Dr. Leddy reported that the number of United States students enrolling annually in the University of Windsor had remained relatively constant at approximately 175, with a resulting annual decrease in the percentage of these students within the total enrolment. Dr. Slater suggested that the anticipated faculty/student ratio in the Faculty of Law of 1/6 until 1972-73 might be one of the main reasons for the anticipated deficit in that area. Dr. DeMarco responded that projections shown for the Faculty of Law did not reflect the new Dean's point of view but rather represented old extrapolations. He indicated that the new Dean was prepared to move to a ratio comparable with that of other university law schools. He suggested, as well, that these figures included other support staff, whereupon Dr. Rossiter requested that the Committee be supplied with a revised page 5 in which academic staff was separated from other staff and in which library costs were delineated separately. He suggested, as well, that the projection be carried beyond 1972-73 in order to give a view of the situation when the Faculty had reached a steady state in enrolment.

A brief discussion was held concerning the need for library facilities, during which Dr. Leddy indicated that the request of the University was for a minimal library which would be essential even with the development of new techniques for information storage and retrieval.

Dr. Rossiter, agreeing with Dr. Leddy in his statement concerning the deficiency of the development of graduate schools in Canada, asked where the students would come from if undergraduate enrolment only increased by an anticipated 89 per cent in Ontario and graduate enrolment increased by 150 per cent by 1975-76. He suggested that even at present almost all students graduating who are able and wish to go on to graduate studies do so.

Mr. Stewart asked what size the University officials would wish to have the University of Windsor reach if they had a free choice. In his response Dr. Leddy indicated that no optimum size had been established for the University, although tentatively 10,000 to 12,000 students appeared reasonable. He qualified this, however, by stressing the University's need to know the Province's requirements and the Government's policy concerning new university development in the western part of Ontario. During the general discussion which followed Dr. Leddy indicated, in response to a question from Mr. Frost, that the colleges of applied arts and technology had developed in parallel with the universities without reducing significantly the demand for places within the universities' potential market. Mr. Baksi suggested that, since education is not restricted to university training, perhaps if society concentrated on making life's jobs challenging and interesting young people would not need to go on to university to the same extent as they do at present.

Referring to the situation with respect to capital financing, Mr. Stewart noted that under the interim formula Windsor had no entitlement for additional space for the next fiscal year. Dr. Wright noted, as well, that 125.8 net assignable square feet per weighted unit of enrolment was considerably above the 96 assignable square feet proposed in the interim formula. Dr. DeMarco indicated the University's recognition of the need to adjust to the availability of funds. He reported that the University had experienced a "bulge" in their requirements and that there was a necessity to spread this out over a longer period of time. He indicated that the submission represented a list of projects for which the University intended to go to the public for support and that these projects had yet to be scrutinized in detail. Dr. Wright indicated the need for a measure of priorities for these projects and explained, in response to a question from Dr. DeMarco, that it was the intention of those responsible for developing the capital formula that no penalty should be imposed upon a university for any private resources it might be able to acquire for capital building purposes.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held
on Tuesday, 18th November, 1969, at The Uni-
versity of Western Ontario, London, Ontario,
at 9:00 a.m.

Minute

1605 PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright	Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur	
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.	
Dr. J. G. Parr	
Dr. R. J. Rossiter	
Dr. D. W. Slater	
Mr. H. A. Cotnam	
Mr. E. E. Stewart	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. J. S. Bancroft	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	

The University of Waterloo Delegation

Mr. C. A. Pollock, Chairman, Board of Governors
Dr. H. E. Petch, President (pro tem)
Dr. J. S. Minas, Vice-President, Academic
Mr. A. K. Adlington, Vice-President, Operations
Mr. A. B. Gellatly, Treasurer
Mr. D. P. Robertson, Director of Academic Services
Dr. D. S. Scott, Dean, Faculty of Engineering
Dr. L. A. K. Watt, Dean, Graduate Studies
Dr. W. U. Ober, Dean, Faculty of Arts
Dr. W. F. Forbes, Dean, Faculty of Mathematics
Dr. W. B. Pearson, Dean, Faculty of Science
Dr. R. M. Irving, Chairman, Department of Geography,
Division of Environmental Studies
Dr. J. C. Gray, Associate Dean of Undergraduate
Affairs, Faculty of Arts,
Integrated Studies

1606 THE UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO BRIEF

Following introductions, Dr. Petch asked Mr. A. B. Gellatly to summarize the items covered in the University's submission.

Referring to enrolment, Mr. Gellatly noted that some 250 students had newly enrolled in advanced years of various courses within the University, coming from a variety of other institutions including the colleges of applied arts and technology. He suggested that this factor, which appeared to be a growing one, would require attention in future years, particularly in programs where enrolment in the first year is limited, as in the Faculty of Engineering where transfers resulted in a second-year enrolment as large as that of the first year.

Mr. Gellatly reported that the University strongly opposed the combining of the capital and operating formulas. He suggested that such a move would be detrimental to making effective priority decisions within the University since it would result in an inevitable controversy over "brains vs bricks". He reported that progress was being made in developing effective management techniques within the University, that "management by objectives" was being adopted for non-academic departments, and that an internal formula unique to that University was being developed to handle the distribution of operating funds. In view of this, he requested that no major changes be made for a few years in the present operating formula.

Indicating that the University would like to change its fiscal year to cover the period 1st May to 30th April, instead of from 1st July to 30th June, Mr. Gellatly asked whether this would be possible for one institution to inaugurate unilaterally. He pointed out that there would be a problem with regard to the way in which co-operative students were counted in the third term, if such a change were adopted, since the value of the basic income unit would be different if the third term were treated as the first term of a new year instead of as the last term of the old fiscal year. Dr. Wright suggested that The University of Waterloo co-operate with the Finance Branch of the Department of University Affairs and with Guelph and McMaster in preparing a technical memorandum on this subject which could be tabled with the Committee on University Affairs and the Committee of Presidents.

Mr. Gellatly reported that, in view of the special costs associated with operating co-operative programs, the University was requesting permission to charge co-operative students a special fee which would not be included in the standard fee for purposes of the operating grants formula. Dr. Wright responded that the present policy allowed the University to have such a special fee and that it would not be improper to recognize

the special costs involved in the co-operative program.

In response to the question concerning the weighting of Optometry students, Dr. Wright indicated that this question would be referred to the Joint Subcommittee on Operating Grants Formula. Mr. Stewart noted that the request by the University to have Optometry considered a health science had been considered by the Senior Co-ordinating Committee and that the University would be receiving an affirmative answer shortly.

Speaking of the integrated studies program, Mr. Gellatly indicated that the University requested a unit weight of 1 for 1969-70 but that in future years it was hoped that the weight could be compatible with that of other combined general/honours programs. Mr. Bancroft suggested that this problem should be self-correcting in view of the direction being taken in the discussions concerning the weighting of such programs.

During the general discussion on enrolment it was noted that the University anticipated an abatement in the ratio of growth from 9 per cent in 1969-70 to 1.45 per cent by 1975-76. It was noted as well that registration in a number of programs had been restricted in the current year, particularly in engineering, architecture, recreation, and physical education. Other programs would be restricted in future years as indicated in the brief. Noting the great pressure on architecture, Dr. Wright asked if Waterloo, Toronto, and Carleton could advise on the net total applications which had been received for the three existing architectural programs in the Province. He noted that the Department of University Affairs would be requested to follow up on this point.

Some general discussion was held concerning the development of integrated studies, environmental studies, and teacher education. It was noted, in connection with the latter, that the transfer of teacher education programs throughout the Province to universities would have to be rationalized. Reference was made to the Subcommittee of the Committee on University Affairs chaired by Dr. Slater. The Subcommittee's interest in the cost analysis for teacher education, as outlined in The University of Waterloo brief, was noted. Dr. Petch reported that the brief had been sent to the Minister in July and that, presumably, it had been forwarded to the Department of Education although the University had not received any response to it to date.

Mr. Stewart noted that Waterloo in the past had omitted including enrolment projections for new programs which had not been approved. He suggested that these be included in future

submissions since if they did come into being they would affect the total planning for university development.

Speaking of capital development, particularly with respect to optometry, Mr. Gellatly suggested that the schedule for that particular development could be delayed by one year since it would be impossible to build for occupancy in 1971. Mr. Stewart explained that development of facilities for optometry would have to be accommodated within the Ontario Health Resources Development Fund and, consequently, that this project would need to be discussed with the Senior Coordinating Committee for Health Sciences.

Mr. Gellatly noted that the capital development had been planned only to 1973 and that items shown for 1974 and 1975 were tentative only. The University had not committed itself to those items. He emphasized that the University had made major adjustments in order to fit the capital program into the terms of the interim formula. There followed a general discussion concerning the problem of development of standards upon which an effective formula for capital development could be established.

Mr. Robertson reported that progress had been made in the development of the Waterloo Academic Scheduling System (WASS). He indicated that no other university had expressed formal interest in adopting this program, although The University of Waterloo was prepared to assist in this manner in accordance with the terms of the original grant which had been made to the University for this purpose.

Dr. Minas reported that informal progress had been made in recent months in improving relations with Waterloo Lutheran University. He explained that the Presidents of the two institutions had asked the Vice-Presidents to establish a formal committee to explore and exploit possible areas of collaboration. This committee was now working, he stated, and was finding it possible to establish joint efforts on a "no-risk" basis without facing up to the problems connected with formal, more sensitive arrangements. Dr. Minas reported that the members of the two university communities and the community at large were enthusiastic about developing effective working relationships and that the co-operative development of shared courses to provide for viable enrolment with ensuing substantial benefit to both institutions was proving advantageous to both universities.

Mr. Adlington reported that the proposal for unicameral government of the University was not yet ready for submission to the Legislature for approval. He explained that Dean Watt was preparing recommendations for basic by-laws governing the substructure, a process which would have to be completed before the Act

itself could be submitted for amendment.

Speaking of development of the North Campus, Dr. Petch explained that the University had deferred a decision, on advice of the Minister, until the needs of the Province for additional facilities had been determined. He indicated that the only section of the North Campus for which development had been planned was the strip of land along Columbia Street which already was provided with services. He requested assurance that the Province was undertaking planning for future development and stressed that the University could not open its North Campus without approximately five years notice since almost the same effort was required to develop that campus as would be needed to establish a new university.

Dr. Wright noted that a planning framework for the Province had been established for several years and that this had been based upon the Government policy of providing places somewhere within the Province for all qualified candidates for admission. He explained that the Government had relied on the universities' initiative to determine their own proper position within the system and that, heretofore, the total of development plans had related adequately to the needs within the Province. He suggested that after 1975 there might be a major change in the needs within the Province and, to assist with that question, the Commission on Post-Secondary Education was evaluating specific requirements for the next ten years and general requirements over a twenty year period.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

.....
Chairman.

.....
Secretary.

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday, 18th November, 1969, with the University of Guelph, at The University of Western Ontario, London commencing at 2:15 p.m.

Minute

1607 PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright	Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur	
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.	
Dr. J. G. Parr	
Dr. R. J. Rossiter	

Mr. H. A. Cotnam

Mr. E. E. Stewart	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. J. S. Bancroft	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	

University of Guelph Delegation

Mr. R. S. Ritchie, Chairman, Board of Governors
Dr. W. C. Winegard, President
Professor B. C. Matthews, Vice-President (Academic)
Mr. J. B. Millward, Vice-President (Administration)
Professor D. G. Ingram, Associate Dean of Research,
Ontario Veterinary College
Professor J. F. Melby, Chairman, Department of Political
Studies, Wellington College
Professor D. R. Murray, Department of History,
Wellington College
Professor H. R. Richards, Department of Consumer Studies,
Macdonald Institute
Professor J. R. Stevens, Department of Physics,
Wellington College
Professor C. M. Switzer, Chairman, Department of Botany,
Ontario Agricultural College
Professor R. L. Thomas, Soil Science Department,
Ontario Agricultural College
Professor H. S. Armstrong, Dean, Faculty of Graduate
Studies and Research
Mr. N. M. Sullivan, Comptroller
Mr. D. Jamieson, Research Advisor to Vice-President
(Administration)

Mr. W. Vaughan, Research Associate to Vice-President
(Academic)

Mr. W. A. Brown, Director of Department of Physical
Resources

Mr. J. Flegg, President, Student Union Council

Mr. B. Brock, Chairman, Graduate Students Association

Mr. G. O. Ankeli, Student Senator, O.A.C.

1608

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH BRIEF

Dr. Winegard reported that by 1985 the University would be reaching its maximum enrolment of 15,000 students. Referring to the brief, he noted the reduction in the growth projected for undergraduate development, particularly in Arts. He reported that freshmen intake had been restricted in all programs in 1969 and that future planning was based on a continuing restriction, primarily because of the problem of finding adequate accommodation for students within the community. A general discussion ensued concerning the relationship between provincial needs and institutional needs with particular reference to the role played by the community in providing accommodation for students.

Dr. Winegard reported that the University intended to develop new programs and to expand programs in which it has particular areas of strength, as outlined in the brief.

He reviewed the situation with respect to development of the campus and facilities and reiterated the request contained in the brief for a special allowance for three-semester operation. He suggested that perhaps 32 per cent of the spring enrolment might be a suitable allowance in capital formula calculations. During the general discussion which followed, Dr. Wright acknowledged that the Committee saw the need to make provision for renovations and replacement and to allow for special situations such as the space occupied by those individuals involved in contract research. He asked the University to supply to the Department of University Affairs the arithmetic concerning the counting of spring term students in arriving at their calculations of space entitlement.

Dr. Winegard indicated that the University did not feel that an allowance of \$55 per net assignable square feet was adequate. He also indicated the University's recognition that there would be no further space entitlement for the University of Guelph until 1972, unless the situation concerning the dining hall changed.

Mr. Flegg, speaking on behalf of the students, expressed concern over the delay in developing the student centre.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Monday, 1st December, 1969, with Brock University, in the Brock Tower of Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario commencing at 9.45 a.m.

Minute

1609 PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright	Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur	
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.	
Dr. R. Gerstein	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Dr. J. G. Parr	
Dr. R. J. Rossiter	
Dr. D. W. Slater	

Mr. H. A. Cotnam

Mr. E. E. Stewart	Secretary
Mr. J. S. Bancroft	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	
Mr. L. H. B. Peebles	

The Committee exchanged introductions with the following representatives from Brock University:

Mr. D. W. Lathrop, Chairman, Board of Governors
Mr. S. S. MacInnes, Q.C. Vice-Chairman, Board of Governors
Dr. J. A. Gibson, President
Dr. A. J. Earp, Provost and Vice-President
Dr. C. A. Plint, Dean, Arts and Science
Mr. R. A. Nairn, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. C. P. Ind, Director of Planning
Mr. P. R. Woodfield, Staff Director of Physical Plant
Mr. T. B. Varcoe, Finance Officer
Professor R. R. Hiatt, Member Senate and Chairman of the
Academic Program Committee
Mr. E. Farnworth, Student Member of Senate
Professor J. A. Moore, President, Brock University Faculty
Association
Mr. P. Beard, President, Brock University Student Assembly

1610 PRESENTATION BY THE BROCK DELEGATION

Dr. Gibson assessed current developments at Brock and mentioned several of the principal items in the brief presented by the University.

(1) On operating account, the formula is generally adequate

but to avoid deficits, Brock requests a more gradual phasing out of emergent support, with a reduction to 10 per cent of formula in 1972-73 and 5 per cent in 1973-74. (Brief, pages 1, 15 and 20).

- (2) In the capital program, Brock is concerned lest planned development be checked by lack of physical facilities. A flexible staging building is urgently needed for arts and science. Prefunding in relation to capital formula is necessary at Brock to meet requirements in two years' time. (Brief, pages 1, 15, 16).
- (3) The future pattern of enrolment is now reasonably foreseeable. Current projections suggest an enrolment of 5,000 by 1980. (Brief, pages 3, 4, 5).
- (4) In the negotiations for integration of St. Catharine's Teachers' College into Brock University, the only remaining issue is whether the education program should be styled a "Faculty of Education", as the Department of Education insists, or a "Division" in accordance with Brock's existing academic structure. (Brief, page 7).

Mr. Lathrop, as Chairman of the Board, noted that Brock had an able staff and eager students. The Niagara community was concerned that the University should not lose its momentum.

Dr. Wright said he was impressed with the brief and the President's analysis which helped in developing understanding.

1611 DISCUSSION OF BROCK UNIVERSITY'S PRESENTATION AND BRIEF

A. Enrolment

In response to a question from Dr. Wright, Dr. Gibson explained that initially nine out of ten of Brock's students came from the St. Catharines region. Now, about 65 per cent are from the local area and the balance from all over the province, including many from Metropolitan Toronto. Residence facilities now in service house 408 out of 1,700 undergraduates. In terms of family income, Brock is reaching into the lower socio-economic groups. About 90 per cent of the grade 12 entrants come from other areas. Mr. Earp noted, only one or two from an individual school. Asked by Dr. Gerstein about selection of grade 12 entrants, Dr. Gibson said the students have to be recommended by their principal or guidance head. All applications are examined by the director of the special summer school and by a Senate Committee which considers maturity and chronological age as well as school records. During the six week summer course, students get a sampling of the university approach to several disciplines and, on the basis of progress reports and final papers, a majority are selected for admission to first year. (Brief, pages 13, 14).

Dr. Lavigne enquired about the performances of students admitted with averages between 58 and 60, (Brief, page 4) and was informed that 8 out of 10 survive their first year and 6 out of 10 graduate, mostly in humanities and social sciences, seldom in mathematics. Dr. Slater questioned the reliability of high school principals' reports and was informed that Brock encourages exchange visits of principals, guidance officers and university faculty members to foster better knowledge of schools and officials.

Dr. Rossiter suggested that if the retention rate for students continues to exceed predictions, the table on page 4 of the brief may be unduly pessimistic. Such figures are inevitably conservative, Dr. Gibson concurred, as the retention rate steadily improves through interview, examination and committee procedures.

B. Programs

Dr. Wright enquired whether there was any thought of a new form of liberal arts and science or of developing a professional faculty. Dr. Gibson believed there was room for a good arts and science program with correctives against rigid departmentalization. He noted that the Senate had imposed a limit on the number of third and fourth year courses that can be offered and mentioned some faculty efforts to develop interdepartmental programs. A School of Urban Studies would be a low priority because of Environmental Studies at Waterloo and elsewhere, but Brock might be able to develop undergraduate courses concerned with regional development. A librarian course for undergraduates was another possibility as was administration in social work related to grant agencies such as the Niagara Region Crippled Children's Centre.

C. Extra-Formula Grants

Mr. Stewart expressed some concern with the dollar projections of enrolment. Last year, he noted, there had been an overrun of \$12 million and again this year several million would be required from Treasury - not a popular procedure. At Brock, for example, since enrolment was higher than anticipated, revenue from the province would also be higher, with extra-formula grants riding on top as a percentage factor. Is this increment really appropriate or should extra-formula grants be fixed?

Dr. Gibson observed that Brock had attempted to work within the Committee guidelines and that the cost per full-time student would decrease to \$2,018 in 1974-75. He mentioned that in the year Brock goes off emergent grants, the University would have less revenue than in the year before. Perhaps the formula should have these factors: a fixed grant for essential administration, a variable grant as a function of size, and a variable grant as a function of time.

Dr. Wright observed that the Committee on University Affairs recommendations had been based on projections of enrolment and that it was more palatable to government not to have a double increment. In the financing of emerging universities, Dr. Slater remarked that the question arises whether an academically attractive arts and science university could emerge on formula without supplements. The formula weighting would be poor indeed if Brock and similar universities had to rely indefinitely on special pleas.

D. Academic Salaries (Brief, Appendix C)

In answer to questions from Dr. Wright and Dr. Slater about the apparently high percentage of budget allotted to academic salaries, Mr. Nairn said the salary breakdown was 71 per cent academic, 29 per cent other which was not unusual, and Mr. Varco pointed out that the total for academic salaries includes library and support staff. The actual percentage for teaching faculty was 43.5 per cent, he said. Dr. Rossiter observed that the average faculty salary appeared to be \$18,000, which seemed high. That average included Deans and others involved in administration, Mr. Earp explained; the average full-time faculty salary was \$13,150 which remained relatively constant.

E. Faculty-Student Ratio (Brief, pages 9, 10)

Dr. Wright said that while he was encouraged by Dr. Gibson's assurance that proliferation of courses would be avoided, he was concerned that faculty-student ratio rather than class size should be used as input. Dr. Plint suggested that if faculty-student ratio is controlled, this of necessity controls the number of courses offered. Acknowledging that the formula has had this effect in the province as a whole, Dr. Wright observed that it will be worthwhile to follow course enrolments for another two or three years. Reduction in unit cost, he said, may have to go further not only for Brock but also for other universities. Concerning small group seminars, Dr. Plint noted that Brock has maintained the pattern with some modifications. To some extent, Professor Hiatt commented, maintaining the seminars have "come out of the hide of faculty members".

F. Capital Projects (Brief, pages 15, 16, Appendix D)

Dr. Plint said the University is concerned with problems of space for academic needs. The interim capital formula has defects for emergent universities, he suggested, because of the large percentage increases in enrolment from year to year. The Glenridge Campus, he said, has 106 square feet per full-time student now but with a projected doubling of students by 1972-73 there would be only 36 square feet per student, taking into account additional office space required. Hence the need for starting more science space immediately. Use of seminar space would reach saturation

level by 1970-71. In answer to a question, Mr. Earp confirmed that the brief presupposes continuing use of Glenridge Campus and that the staging building is to handle spill-over from Glenridge. Dr. Wright acknowledged that the interim capital formula has flaws, especially with regard to emerging universities. Nevertheless, 1974-75 shows a space index of 123. In the intervening period there is a case for some capital support. Mr. Ind noted that Brock has allowed a three to five year lead time in its planning since the larger a university gets, the smaller the growth factor. By 1977, Brock should be close to the Department of University Affairs levels. The problem of availability of capital may make it difficult to maintain the present level of capital support, Dr. Wright suggested, so that the emphasis must be on general purpose space. Limited resources raise the problem of division of capital between the emerging universities and the space needs of the developed universities.

Discussion followed about using SEF units to provide flexibility plus reduction in cost. Dr. Wright wondered whether Brock might be interested in participating in a package deal. Dr. Gibson said yes, agreeing that a staging building with SEF modules might be a reasonable alternative. Brock could experiment without hazarding its master plan, but more than a nibbling approach would be necessary and they would wish to avoid temporary buildings that tended to become permanent. Mr. Ind expressed willingness to investigate SEF as one alternative. To exploit SEF, a consortium of universities, with CUA and DUA support would be necessary, Dr. Wright concluded.

Dr. Gibson remarked that Brock has not abandoned the idea of including some physical recreation space in the staging structure, as it is becoming increasingly difficult to justify to the community the lack of a gymnasium. He mentioned also the expected addition of 400 elementary school teachers next year who would need training facilities. Mr. Lathrop concurred and Mr. MacInnes pointed out that there was not a single social or recreational facility on the campus; no showers, no team sports facilities. The undergraduates were being short-changed. In answer to a question from Mr. Frost, Dr. Gibson indicated that there was a dearth of physical education facilities in the St. Catharines area. Mr. Frost wondered whether private funds might be available since the burden on the taxpayer was pretty heavy. Mr. MacInnes indicated that the founding fund first had to meet its primary objectives. Dr. Lavigne noted that the University of Ottawa had 7,000 students without recreational facilities and Mr. Lathrop commented on the sad lack of such facilities in the Niagara Peninsula as a

whole. Dr. Wright said he thought the Committee on University Affairs understood the problem and in conclusion thanked Brock University for presenting an excellent brief.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Monday, 1st December, 1969, with McMaster University, in the Brock Tower of Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario commencing at 1:30 p.m.

Minute

1612 PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright	Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur	
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.	
Dr. R. Gerstein	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.	
Dr. J. G. Parr	
Dr. R. J. Rossiter	
Dr. D. W. Slater	

Mr. H. A. Cotnam

Mr. E. E. Stewart	Secretary
Mr. J. S. Bancroft	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	
Mr. L. H. B. Peebles	

The following representatives from McMaster University were present:

Mr. R. B. Taylor, Chairman, Board of Governors
Dr. H. G. Thode, President and Vice-Chancellor
Dr. A. N. Bourns, Vice-President, Science
Dr. J. R. Evans, Vice-President, Health Sciences and
Dean of Medicine
Dr. R. J. Gillespie, Professor of Chemistry
Mr. D. M. Hedden, Vice-President, Administration
Dr. W. F. Hellmuth, Vice-President, Arts
Dr. J. W. Hodgins, Dean of Engineering
Mr. J. R. Buckley, Student Senator, representing
Division of Science and Engineering
Mr. M. D. Lawson, Student Senator, representing Division
of Arts

1613 MCMASTER UNIVERSITY SUBMISSION

Dr. Thode introduced the McMaster representatives and spoke to several of the major items in the McMaster brief:

A. University Government

Revisions in university government to provide for more student participation and for joint Board-Senate committees had improved communications and the system was said

to be working well.

B. Faculties of Education

The Senate had approved the CPUO - Department of Education agreement concerning integration of teachers' colleges into university faculties of education and a Senate Committee on Education was to make specific recommendations.

C. Law School

If and when the Province requires another Law School to meet the demand for student places, McMaster might be a logical location since Hamilton was the centre of a metropolitan area with a large law fraternity.

D. Enrolment

Enrolment for the 1969-70 academic year was not up to expectations for reasons explained in pages 32-33 of the brief. Projections had, therefore, been modified, but undergraduate enrolment was expected to be back on schedule next year. Meanwhile, there was a shortfall in operating grants.

E. Post-doctoral Fellows

Formula income was requested for post-doctoral fellows. The number at McMaster was small but significant - about 150 in Science, Engineering and Medicine. The capital formula also did not take into account post-doctoral space requirements. Without formula support, it was argued that some of the most talented people could be lost to established schools of advanced studies in the United States. The program needed support, but not at the expense of undergraduate studies.

F. Arts and Science

Dr. Hellmuth, commenting on the Arts section of the brief, explained that McMaster was seeking to add doctoral programs in Political Science and Philosophy to its established graduate programs. The increase in full-time M.B.A. students had been less than expected, but part-time enrolment was continuing to grow. With a view to developing a teacher education program, McMaster was consulting with the Ontario Teachers' Federation, Hamilton Teachers' College and the Deans of the Colleges of Education.

Dr. Bourns discussed developments in Science at McMaster, noting that there had been no expansion in pure science in the current year, but some growth in applied physics and chemistry. Liaison with industry to provide students with related summer experience had met good response. The University's proposal to offer a master's program in biophysics in conjunction with the Health Sciences Centre might have to be postponed, he said. The Chemical Engineering Department was negotiating with the Department of

Energy, Mines and Resources for a development grant of \$100,000 a year for water resources research. In applied mathematics, McMaster hoped for an early start on a graduate program in statistics at the Ph.D. level. Dr. Bourns noted that the drop in science and engineering enrolment reflected efforts to reduce the numbers of non-Canadian graduate students, especially in fields where employment opportunities were limited. Not all universities have faced up to this problem. Stressing the importance of post-doctoral fellows in maintaining quality and providing opportunities for Canadians and landed immigrants of promise, Dr. Bourns observed that formula financing did not provide support for post-doctoral studies.

The university, Dr. Bourns said, faced very serious financial difficulties as a result of the levelling off of graduate enrolment and important new programs in science would have to be postponed. Without rapid growth it was not possible to underwrite new programs, he said, predicting that a levelling off of graduate enrolment might become general in Canada.

G. Medical Developments

Dr. Evans summarized medical developments at the University, mentioning areas of expansion, such as nursing and Clinical Behavioural Science, and problem areas, such as Family Medicine, where there was a lack of good candidates, and Biochemistry and Medical Science, where the M.A. and Ph.D. enrolment was less than anticipated. In Physiotherapy, he noted, the lack of clear lines of responsibility between the University and Mohawk College seemed to require a policy solution.

Most serious had been the impact of strikes in delaying, by a year, the completion of the Health Sciences Centre and therefore slowing down the annual build-up of enrolment in undergraduate medicine as well as in graduate programs. Dr. Evans projected the consequences of this slowdown in a plateau budget from 1970-71 to 1972-73 (Brief, page 21). He therefore requested that the Committee consider phasing out the development grant by one year (Brief, page 22). Dr. Evans also recommended that the Committee reconsider the role of post-doctoral fellows in the formula system.

H. Capital Financing

In Section B of the brief relating to capital financing, Mr. Hedden drew the attention of the Committee to Exhibit I, which projected a total enrolment of 11,418 in 1975-76 and Exhibit II, which showed a steady increase in part-time enrolment. As enrolment approached 12,000 full-time students, he observed, the Ancaster campus had to be made

ready if the Province wished McMaster to proceed with further expansion. Exhibit V, he noted, showed, for 1970-71, \$10 million already committed for capital projects, plus \$13 million required and \$29 million for Health Sciences. Referring to Exhibit VII, Mr. Hedden considered the unit value of 97.77 square feet from the interim formula 130 base to be too low and a base of 140 nasf to be more realistic. Mr. Hedden questioned whether residence kitchenettes and nuclear reactor space should be included in McMaster's space assessment (B 13). He suggested that financial entitlement should be for a year ahead to measure adequacy by future requirements. Many students would graduate, he said, having experienced only crowded facilities.

In conclusion, Mr. Hedden emphasized that the interim capital formula, as explained in B 14 and 15 should allow for: (1) a wider range of weights, (2) a higher dollar multiplier for special space requirements, (3) differing local construction costs, (4) stabilization of inventory categories, and (5) inclusion of space requirements for post-doctoral fellows.

Mr. Lawson, speaking as a student senator, mentioned that the University had fallen behind in providing the non-academic or informal educational facilities needed to break down the impersonal lack of communication in the University community and maintain good relations.

Mr. Buckley's comments reflected student concern with the quality of undergraduate education. He suggested that first year classes with a ratio of several hundred to one were ridiculous, that televised instruction was even more impersonal and that lecture notes could be copied more efficiently by Xerox. Fewer lecture hours would permit reallocation of staff and reduction in class size. More latitude in choice of courses would be desirable, with specialization for some students and a multidisciplinary approach for others. Today's students want a chance to be educated, not mass-produced, Mr. Buckley stated.

The discussion that followed the McMaster presentation could be summarized as follows:

1. Graduate Enrolment - Foreign Students

Dr. Rossiter noted that graduate projections for last year showed a greater increase than undergraduate enrolment and that the only way to reach such projections would be by importing graduate students from other countries, which would be undesirable. The answer, Dr. Bourns suggested, might be to freeze enrolment in chemistry and physics and increase graduate enrolment in applied mathematics, geography, psychology and sociology, but this was not happening. He expressed concern about the wholesale

(1)

(1)

(1)

(1)

(1)

(1)

(1)

importation of graduate students. Dr. Hellmuth agreed with Dr. Slater that this might be a potential problem in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Many imported graduate students remain in Canada, Dr. Thode indicated, including some from underdeveloped countries. Dr. Wright suggested that our graduate schools seemed to serve as a device for recruitment of high level immigrants. Mr. Frost commented that there might, therefore, be a net benefit to the Province.

2. Graduate Employment

Dr. Bourns commented that there was a problem of jobs for doctoral graduates. Canada had a new resource of technically trained manpower, but had not found how to use them. Government, in co-operation with universities and industry, might find solutions. Dr. Lavigne observed that any respectable large company would make a market survey before investing large sums in a product. He suggested that Federal and Provincial governments co-operate in updating employment surveys. Dr. Wright stated that the Committee did not engage in deterministic manpower planning or direct people into occupations.

3. Post-Doctoral Fellows

The upper 20 per cent of Ph.D. graduates, Dr. Bourns estimated, were able to develop a research career and needed post-doctoral training. Dr. Gerstein remarked that the Province provided only \$750,000 for grants-in-aid of research and wondered whether McMaster's \$73,000 share was meaningful when doled out in small amounts. Dr. Thode replied that only if they could attract funds could universities like McMaster have post-doctoral programs and that such sums were welcomed, therefore, even if limited. To encourage research by young staff members, \$1,500 could be very helpful, Dr. Bourns noted. The application of science to the solution of important social problems had lagged, Dr. Slater suggested.

4. Capital Projects

With reference to the space inventory, Dr. Wright noted that it was essential to have consistent definitions. Mr. McCullough confirmed that dining areas, including residence kitchenettes, qualified under the Capital Aid Corporation. The inventory merely asked for areas the Province had funded, Mr. Stewart commented. Dr. Thode pointed out that large areas of McMaster's accelerator and reactor could not be used by students and that the facilities were used 20 per cent of the time by other universities. Dr. Wright observed that many universities have special research facilities, funded in part by specially earmarked funds, that there was not yet a final capital formula and that the objective was to

follow a consistent set of definitions for inventory for all universities.

In reply to a question from Dr. Slater, Mr. Hedden said that McMaster had not undertaken specific studies to determine the scale of needs for part-time students in relation to capital projects, but that the Capital Studies Committee, as a result of a study by York University, had concluded that more offices were needed.

Dr. Parr enquired whether McMaster students had given any thought to financing their own social facilities. The Student Union Budget was in good shape, Mr. Lawson replied, but it was difficult to get the whole university community to work together.

5. Health Sciences

Dr. Slater asked about supplementary financing for Health Sciences, in effect, an additional \$1.8 million. Dr. Evans replied that the difficulty had arisen from the slowdown in enrolment and the problem of staffing. Labour troubles had delayed the enrolment build-up by a full academic year. In reply to a comment by Dr. Rossiter that the uneven grant structure in Table II was less credible than a gradual phasing out, Dr. Evans explained that the unevenness was linked to unfulfilled expectations of revenue from enrolment. Dr. Slater observed that, while not claiming that innovation in medical programs could be achieved without costs, an overwhelming case, with hard evidence, was needed to justify \$1,850,000. Dr. Evans discussed staffing, noting that a significant proportion of resources went to the Clinical Department. Matched funds from the Health Fund, he said, meant greater mileage from a DUA dollar. Dr. Slater suggested that Dr. Evans might set down in writing for the Committee the points he had made verbally, and Dr. Wright commented that much more detailed studies would be required, based on extensive modelling. Dr. Evans invited members of the Committee on University Affairs, such as Dr. Rossiter, to come on site and see how the resources were being used.

6. Operating Grants - Monetary Fund

Referring to the anticipated level of operating grants which would be short of McMaster's projections, Dr. Slater enquired whether the University would find attractive some sort of pooling scheme similar to the European Payments Union. Mr. Hedden replied that this was the year that McMaster would respond favourably to such a plan.

7. Law School

Concerning the possibility of a Law School at McMaster, Dr. Wright raised two questions: (1) whether the capital

investment involved should be applied to the expansion of existing schools, and (2) whether newer and smaller universities without professional facilities should be considered.

8. Concluding Remarks

Mr. Taylor, Chairman of the Board, remarked that the Province was confronted with a calculus of opportunities and increments and a Procrustean operation of trying to make ideals fit facts without banging the till on needy fingers. Perhaps, he suggested, we need post-doctoral studies to provide solutions.

1614 ROYAL BOTANICAL GARDENS SUBMISSION

A delegation consisting of the following representatives of the Royal Botanical Gardens met with the Committee:

Mr. W. G. Welby, President of the Board
Mr. C. E. Amy, Chairman of the Board
Mr. L. Laking, Director of the Royal Botanical Gardens
Dr. H. G. Thode, President, McMaster University

Mr. Welby introduced his delegation and, speaking in support of the proposals in their brief, noted that the Royal Botanical Gardens were carrying on the same work as in previous years in the face of increasing costs. He extended an invitation to the Committee to visit the Gardens. Mr. Laking pointed out that in the past four years there had been only a 12 per cent increase in overall revenues, including municipal grants, in comparison with a 51 per cent increase in the cost of groundsmen. In the current year, \$20,000 was being directed toward the construction of the basement of the new greenhouse and work on the equipment centre had been deferred to 1970-71. In response to a question from Dr. Wright, Mr. Laking agreed that capital projects had been going on at about the same pace for a number of years, with gradual additions to the Arboretum and botanical improvements in the headquarters area. Mr. Bancroft enquired about the additional \$48,000 in this year's request, noting that \$23,000 was earmarked for continued physical development and \$25,000 for scientific and educational programs, but there seemed to be no comparative figure for the \$62,000 salary item. Mr. Laking said that this breakdown had been omitted from last year's brief. The \$23,000 item was for the paving of the Arboretum road. The brief explained the increases related to pathology and other items. Dr. Wright commented that, notwithstanding the excellent services provided by the Royal Botanical Gardens, the problem remained of justifying large percentage increases, regardless of the size of the budget. Dr. Thode pointed out that the Gardens provided facilities for research in biology, both for McMaster University and for the University of Guelph. The Royal Botanical Gardens' 1800 acre stand

of hardwood trees was unique in Canada. Mr. Stewart noted that it would be some time before we would know the results of the CUA recommendations and the Government's decisions, but there had been general instructions to all government departments to hold increases to 6 per cent. Mr. Amy said the Board was grateful for the assistance the Gardens had received in the past and noted that they would not have spent for scientific purposes funds earmarked for other things without the confidence that the Committee would assist fully.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held
on Tuesday, 2nd December, 1969, at Erindale
College commencing at 9:15 a.m.

Minute
1615

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.
Dr. R. Gerstein
Dr. M. J. Lavigne
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.
Dr. J. G. Parr
Dr. R. J. Rossiter
Dr. D. W. Slater

Mr. H. A. Cotnam
Mr. J. C. Yen

Mr. E. E. Stewart Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon
Mr. J. S. Bancroft
Mr. J. D. McCullough

University of Toronto Representatives

Mr. O. D. Vaughan, Chairman, Board of Governors
Dr. C. Bissell, President
Mr. J. H. Sword, Executive Vice-President (Academic
and Provost)
Mr. R. Ross, Vice-President and Registrar
Mr. A. G. Rankin, Executive Vice-President
(Non-Academic)
Dr. E. Sirluck, Dean, Graduate Studies
Dr. A. D. Allen, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science
Dr. A. L. Chute, Dean, Faculty of Medicine
Dr. J. M. Ham, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science
and Engineering
Dr. J. D. Hamilton, Vice-President, Health Sciences
Professor L. E. M. Lynch, Commissioner, Commission
on University Government
Mr. A. G. Webster, Commission on University Government
Professor B. Etkin, Representing the Association of
Teaching Staff
Professor F. E. Winter, Chairman, Association of
Teaching Staff
Mr. R. H. Blackburn, Chief Librarian

Mr. G. K. Abols, President, Students Administrative Council

Mr. M. B. Vaughan, President, Graduate Students Union
Professor D. F. Forster, Executive Assistant to the President

Mrs. F. Ireland, Research Assistant to the President

Scarborough College

Mr. A. F. W. Plumptre, Principal
Dean S. J. Coleman

Erindale College

Mr. J. T. Wilson, Principal
Dean E. A. Robinson

Dr. R. J. Rossiter assumed the Chair for the first hour. He expressed the regrets of Dr. Wright and Mr. Stewart, explaining that they had been delayed on Government business.

1616

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO BRIEF

Dr. Bissell referred to his letter of 20th November to the Chairman of the Committee in which he outlined the pattern of discussion the University hoped to follow at this meeting. He explained that the previous year's submission still formed the basis for the University's overall planning and hence should be used as a basis for discussion. He emphasized the problem facing the University with a decrease in flexibility occasioned by the decline in increase in enrolment. He explained that the University was looking to internal economies and to private support in order to allow it to continue to adjust after the total enrolment capacity had been reached.

Dr. Bissell then introduced, in turn, various representatives of the University who spoke on specific problems mentioned in Dr. Bissell's letter.

A. New Program in the Faculty of Arts and Science

Dean Allen explained that the major problem in developing the new program in Arts and Science was to sort out the courses; a problem which was overcome only by great effort expended by all concerned. The results, however, were such as to offer the students a much wider variety of choice and to achieve a working integration between the University and the Colleges to an extent never before realized. He explained that the introduction of the new program in Arts and Science had been extended, with some modifications, to both Scarborough and Erindale Colleges.

Speaking of the budgetary restrictions being faced in conjunction with the development of the program, Dean Allen noted that a number of courses had an enrolment of over

500, several of over 1,000, and one course of over 1,500 students. At the same time, some tutorial sessions had expanded to accommodate 30-50 students as a result of the limited resources. He suggested that a re-examination of the Arts and Science components of the operating grants formula was required to ensure recognition of the changes in approach and methods which have taken place within recent years.

In response to a question from Dr. Bissell, Dean Allen reported that the broader choice of programs now available to students had resulted in some shift from humanities courses to social science courses, although his impression was that the shift was less in 1969-70 than in the previous year. He stated that a relatively constant proportion of students continued to choose science courses.

B. The Graduate School

Dean Sirluck distributed tabulated material on enrolment and employment patterns of students in the Faculty of Graduate Studies.* With respect to enrolment, he explained that the increase in the number of part-time students was greater than forecast for 1969-70 but that this had been balanced by a slight decrease in the number of full-time students so that the final result approximated the figure which had been forecast. He indicated that the increase in enrolment in life sciences had not been as great as had been anticipated and that the increase in humanities had been restricted by admissions policy.

Dean Sirluck reported that approximately six departments planned to reduce the numbers of students to be admitted because of concern about the employment opportunities available to them. Although another twelve departments planned to hold to the current enrolment pattern in anticipation of a future decrease in demand for graduates, a great number of departments could foresee no possibility of meeting the demands for their graduates for some years to come.

Mr. Blackburn commented at some length on the implications of the operating budget of the new research library. He suggested that the cost of research collections were more related to the number of fields covered than they were to enrolment; for example, library costs for Far Eastern studies were approximately 35 times those of French or German per graduate student. He explained, as well, that a large library such as that developed at the University of Toronto produced an increase in unit cost because of the specialized nature of many of the collections. As an example of this type of cost, he reported that 30 per cent of the additions to collections in languages were in

* See Appendix A

languages that did not use the Roman alphabet. He reported, as well, that Toronto's costs were increased because, under the inter-library loan program, the University distributed to other institutions eleven times the number of items that it received. Not only was staff required to handle this extra workload, but staff and space was also required to accommodate the large number of visitors to the University library from other institutions.

- C. The Small Professional Faculty in the General Multiversity
Mr. Sword outlined the problems being faced by a relatively neglected group of disciplines on the University of Toronto campus. He referred specifically to architecture, business, education, forestry, law, library science, and social work. He suggested that these faculties required flexibility also, especially during the period of shortage of funds, and noted that the reinforcement of humanities and social sciences by the Ontario Graduate Fellowship Program had not been shared by these divisions. Noting that all of these programs required support from the fundamental programs in other faculties, he explained that society was looking both to the University and to the Professors to introduce changes in curriculum required to respond to the altering circumstances and demands made by society on the graduates. He suggested that the dilemma, in part, of a small professional faculty was how the lag in development could be overcome and how hopes and aspirations for improvement could be realized.

Dr. Wright suggested that attention to these problems more logically became the responsibility of the Senate and of the University than of the Committee on University Affairs.

D. Health Sciences

Dr. Hamilton outlined the problems in developing and maintaining adequate programs in the Health Sciences under a system through which support was received from a wide variety of sources. He suggested that the scale of support from the Ontario Hospital Services Commission in the clinical field was not adequate, with a resulting net disadvantage to medicine; at the same time the clinical fields had been left out of the planning of the Department of University Affairs. He noted that other divisions of Health Sciences, for example, nursing, dentistry, pharmacy, medical social work and clinical psychology did not have similar funds, a factor which created an even more divisive effect. Dr. Chute suggested that the development of current methods of financing of Health Sciences had been detrimental to them. With sources coming from the University, teaching hospitals, research funds and fees from patients, it was impossible to make a clear division in function. To these problems had been added the difficulty created by the change in approach to curriculum development. Dr. Chute

explained that, in the past, university appointments were their own reward since they guaranteed referrals. Such was no longer the case, particularly with full-time appointments. At the same time, he stated that, since most research is carried out by medical schools and not by government or others as is the case in other sciences, it is impossible for them to acquire appropriate funds for funding new programs. He indicated that much of the increased support recently had gone to pay clinical teachers.

In response to a question from the Committee, Dr. Chute indicated that some functions of the Medical School should be separately financed, particularly in the development of new programs where no further operating support can be forthcoming with a fixed enrolment. There followed some general discussion during which the need for co-ordinating planning, in the clinical areas particularly, was emphasized.

E. Capital Needs

Mr. Rankin stated that the University of Toronto was at a distinct disadvantage under the capital and operating grants formula since it was not growing significantly in enrolment. He stated that the subsidiary and satellite operations of the University were a burden on operating funds since they do not generate formula income although they occupy space and use facilities of the University. He referred to such organizations as the Great Lakes Institute, the Centre for International Studies, and the Institute for Quantitative Analysis of Social and Economic Policy.

Noting the age and condition of a number of the buildings on the University of Toronto campus, Mr. Rankin outlined the need in an older, established university for funds for replacement and renovations. He suggested that more attention needed to be given to the provision of research space. With respect to the introduction of capital formula, Mr. Rankin stated that the timing of its implementation had caused particular problems to the University. He requested that the impact of the introduction of this formula on the operating formula be re-examined, that the requirement that the University finance 5 per cent of each capital project could no longer be met, particularly for Scarborough and Erindale; that immediate special support for replacement of obsolete facilities was required; and that the budget for the capital formula should be based upon more than a one-year period, hopefully for five years or at least three years.

Dr. Ham outlined the need for engineering facilities, indicating that 58 per cent of the space currently occupied was substandard and in need of renovation and replacement. He indicated that the University wished to replace the Mining Building and part of Physics with a multi-faculty building.

Dr. Wright explained that it was intended that the final capital formula would treat requirements for funds for renovation and replacement and that the necessity of providing funds in 1970-71 for this purpose had been recognized even though a final policy had not yet been established. Speaking of the problems raised with respect to the new library, he indicated that the concern of the Committee and of the Department of University Affairs had been that the building might take up so much of the support earmarked for the University of Toronto that it would prejudice other worthwhile development. He then stated at some length the concern of the Committee that universities develop buildings which could be re-assigned as situations and requirements changed over the year.

F. Faculty Responsibilities in the Multiversity

Professor Winter explained at some length the problems being faced by faculty members in the complex environment of the modern multiversity. Professor Etkin, speaking on this topic, referred to a study conducted in 1966 by Hansen and Sandler in which the amount of time spent by faculty members in their various duties was analyzed in detail. He emphasized that the heavy load carried by faculty members in 1966 had increased markedly with recent developments in curricula and the change in approach to undergraduate studies. Both professors emphasized the need for adjustments to be made in order to prevent a decline in quality of university education.

G. Student Morale in the Multiversity

Mr. Abols presented a brief, copies of which were distributed to members of the Committee, outlining the concerns being felt by students about the formal educational process in which they were involved.

H. Implications of the Commission on University Government

Professor Lynch emphasized that the report on university government was designed for the University of Toronto, not as a plan for all universities. He emphasized, as well, that it represented a report only, not a policy statement of the University. He explained that, in the recommendations of the Commission, it was anticipated that the Council would become a viable entity as the obvious public voice of the University, arguing the institution's case before both Government and the people. As such, the Council would have to be more broadly representative of the University community and would have to take into account the University's geographic and social setting. In the latter context, he suggested that an external affairs committee would be required to provide a forum of discussion on community matters directly affecting the University, for example, the Spadina Expressway extension.

Professor Lynch indicated that the Commission supported decentralization of the budget and a better scheduling of the process of budget development. In order to assist with this, he suggested that a longer range system of budgeting by the Province, covering a three to five year progression, would help greatly.

Speaking of the financing of church-related colleges, Professor Lynch indicated that students following college courses should be eligible for full Government grants.

With respect to capital facilities, he indicated that the Commission recommended space be planned on an interdisciplinary basis, not by a single department or discipline. He indicated support for development of Innis and of New College and expressed sympathy for the extension of colleges into professional areas.

As to curriculum, he recommended that all courses in Arts and Science be open to all students in all faculties and made a plea for recognition of the financial stake which non-academics have in the university community.

Mr. Webster spoke, as well, about a number of the basic recommendations inherent in the CUG report and about the implications of the introduction of different types of financial assistance to students.

LUNCHEON

1617 ERINDALE COLLEGE

Mr. Wilson, referring to the brief which had been circulated to members of the Committee, outlined briefly the development to date of Erindale College. He suggested that the College could, in time, accommodate 15,000 students in a variety of faculties. In order to do so, however, he stressed the need for some indication as to the role which would be expected of the College in future years. He described in detail some of the changes in curricula and adaptations in methods of operating and governing the College which were being adopted successfully.

Speaking of physical facilities, he suggested that while the 247 acres presently comprising the Erindale site were adequate for building purposes, the need to protect the borders of the University was apparent. In order to do so he recommended that the approximately 50 acres remaining between Mississauga Road and the river should be purchased for the College.

Responding to Mr. Wilson's request for guidance in planning, Dr. Wright explained that the Committee would first like to

be guided by the University's own studies. He indicated that it would be more feasible to have the Committee respond to recommendations which might be forthcoming from a study conducted by the University of the need for development in the next five to ten years in order to respond to requirements of the area.

Speaking of the points raised concerning space provisions, Dr. Wright referred to the interim capital formula and suggested that it was the opinion of the Committee that resources should be provided which could be used to best advantage by the institution in determining the optimal types of space to be built. As far as the timing of developments or the speed with which the Erindale campus should be expanded, Dr. Wright suggested that a balance would have to be determined between the needs and the resources available, and that an indication of a possible rate of development might be forthcoming when the Committee had made its recommendations.

Dean Robinson emphasized the need to have a framework for future development and for a model for the next two or three years to provide answers for those questions requiring an immediate solution.

Both men mentioned the benefits of association with the University of Toronto and reiterated the intention of the College to remain a part of that institution for some time to come.

Mr. Stewart noted that, on the long range plans submitted by both Scarborough and Erindale Colleges, the net assignable square feet per unit were shown as being more than 130 by 1975, instead of the 96 suggested in the guidelines. He suggested that these expectations might not be realistic nor did there appear much possibility of realizing the higher unit costs indicated in these plans.

1618 SCARBOROUGH COLLEGE

Principal Plumptre reported that enrolment had exceeded expectations in the 1969-70 year with the result that the freshmen enrolment of over 900 students would have to be reduced to approximately 600 for the next two years unless more space was provided. He suggested that, with approximately 85 per cent of the students coming from Metropolitan Toronto, it was very difficult for the College to do its own calculation of enrolment projections.

He reported that, with the flexibility provided by the new academic program, there appeared to be a much greater willingness to work on the part of the students than had been evident in past years. This industriousness on their part had resulted in a shortage of study space early in the year, a situation which he anticipated would become more pronounced as the year progressed. He stressed the involvement of students

in the operation of the College, and made specific reference to the significant influence made by the presence of graduate students on the campus. He indicated that residence facilities were still required, with 250 students from outside Metro attending the College, and expressed the hope that the building program could be phased with the enrolment growth. In connection with this, he suggested that a new set of projections could be submitted which would be in accordance with the standards outlined in the guidelines.

Dean Coleman spoke in general terms of the relationship with the main campus and expressed the wish of the College to develop Scarborough as an academic entity of worth which could continue to operate effectively and inventively in experimenting both in areas of academic development and administrative structure.

1619 OTHER COMMENTS

In response to a question from Dr. Bissell, Dr. Wright explained that funds acquired from private sources would not be charged against a university's capital entitlement in order that private donors might be induced to invest in the development of the universities.

Dr. Slater requested that the University consider sending to the Committee copies of the presentations given orally. Indicating that this would be done, Dr. Bissell explained the desire of the University to focus on specific problems.

In response to a question from Mr. Webster concerning the formula weight for arts and science programs, Dr. Wright explained that the Committee had agreed to undertake cost studies in this area. He explained that the present weighting reflected current spending rather than optimal spending.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

Ph.D. Graduates, 1969: Employment

DIVISION I

<u>Department</u>	<u>No. of Ph.D.'s</u>	<u>Ontario Univs. & Colleges</u>	<u>Other Canadian Univs.</u>	<u>Univs. Abroad</u>	<u>Canadian Gov't.</u>	<u>Gov't. Abroad</u>	<u>Canadian Industry</u>	<u>Industry Abroad</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Not y placed</u>
Art History	-									
Classical Studies	3 (8*)	2 (5)	(2)	1 (1)						
Drama	-									
East Asian Studies	-									
English	14	6	3	4					1	
French	6	4	1	1						
German	2	2								
History	8	6	1	1						
Islamic Studies	-									
Italian & Hispanic Languages & Lits.										
Medieval Studies										
Music	(1*)			(1)						
Near Eastern Studies	1									1
Philosophy	13	6	2	2					1 2 unknown	
Slavic Lang. & Lit.	3 (14*)	1 (8)	(1)	2 (2)					(3)	

* ABD's

Ph.D. Graduates, 1969: Employment

DIVISION II

<u>Department</u>	<u>No. of Ph.D's</u>	<u>Ontario Univs. & Colleges</u>	<u>Other Canadian Univs.</u>	<u>Univs. Abroad</u>	<u>Canadian Gov't.</u>	<u>Gov't. Abroad</u>	<u>Canadian Industry</u>	<u>Industry Abroad</u>	<u>Other</u>
Anthropology									
Educational Theory	16	4	3	7		1			1
Geography	-								
Sociology	3	3							
Political Economy	8	5			1	1			1

DIVISION III

Department	No. of Ph.D.'s	Ontario Univs. & Colleges	Other Canadian Univs.	Univs. Abroad	Canadian Gov't.	Gov't. Abroad	Canadian Industry	Industry Abroad	Other	No. Pl.
Aerospace Studies	6	2					1		2**	11
Astronomy	2		1		1					
Chemical Engineering	9				2		4	1	1	1
Chemistry	22 (18 on post-docs.)	5	2	12		1	1	1		
Civil Engineering	1					1				
Computer Science	9 (since Ph.D. established)	2	1	2	1		2	1		
Electrical Eng.	7	4	1	1			1			
Geology	1		1**							
Industrial Eng.	4	3					1			
Mathematics	11	6	1	4						
Mechanical Engineering										
Metallurgy & Mat.Sci.	8 (2 years)		1	3**			1	3		11
Physics 2	19	7	1	5	2		2	1		1

** postdoctorals

2 - all university posts non-permanent

1 - undecided, prospects exist

(postdoctoral or research assts.)

Ph.D. Graduates, 1969: Employment

DIVISION IV

<u>Department</u>	<u>No. of Ph.D.'s</u>	<u>Ontario Univs. & Colleges</u>	<u>Other Canadian Univs.</u>	<u>Univs. Abroad</u>	<u>Canadian Gov't. Abroad</u>	<u>Canadian Industry</u>	<u>Industry Abroad</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Not plac</u>
Anatomy	1		1						
Biochemistry	2	1						1**	
Dentistry	-								
Hygiene	1				1				
Medical Biophysics	2			1				1	
Medical Science	-								
Pathological Chem. - since 1960	10	7			1			2	
Pathology - since 1963	5	4		1					
Pharmacy	2			1				1**	
Physiology	-								
Zoology	10	2	1					7**	
Botany	5	1	1	1					2**
Psychology	8	1	1	2	2			2**	
Forestry	2				1			1	

** postdoctorals

Enrolment as at December 1 (excluding Educational Theory)

	1969	1968	1967	1966	1965	1964
Full Time	3844	3409	3308	2774	2381	1924
Part Time	986	713	508	489	315	313
Total, Full and Part Time	4830	4122	3816	3263	2696	2237
Full Time Equivalent (Part Time 1/3)	4173	3647	3477	2937	2486	2028
Per Cent Increase	+14.4	+ 4.9	+18.4	+18.1	+22.6	+26.0

School of Graduate Studies Enrolment by Divisions - December 1st, 1969 and December 1st, 1968

	Full Time				Part Time			
	Dec. 1/69	Dec. 1/68	Change	%	Dec. 1/69	Dec. 1/68	Change	%
Division I Hum	1117	1014	+103	+10.2	424	279	+145	+52.0
Division II Soc Sc	921	754	+167	+22.2	216	196	+ 20	+10.2
Division III Phys Sc.	1182	1080	+102	+ 9.4	257	182	+ 75	+41.2
Division IV Ed Sc	624	561	+ 63	+11.2	89	56	+ 33	+58.9
Totals	3844	3409	+435	+12.8	986	713	+273	+38.3
Totals, Full and Part Time	4830	4122	+708	+17.2				
Total Full Time Equivalents*	4173	3647	+526	+14.4				
Educational Theory	375	302	+ 73	+24.1	956	752	+204	+27.1
Grand Totals	4219	3711	+508	+13.7	1942	1465	+477	+32.6
Totals, Full and Part Time	6161	5176	+985	+19.0				
Total, Full Time Equivalents* including Ed. Theory	4866	4199	+667	+15.9				

* Part Time counted as one-third

Analysis of Enrolment by Citizenship Status

	Canadian		Landed Imm.		Student Visa									
	*	**	*	**	U.S.A.	U.K.	Europe	Asia	Africa	Others				
	69/70	68/69	69/70	68/69	69/70	68/69	69/70	68/69	69/70	68/69	69/70	68/69	69/70	68/69
All Degrees (incl. <i>educ. theory</i>)	67.5	67.7%	21.3	16%	3.5	5.3%	1.3	1.8%	.6	.9%	3.4	5.4%	.9	1.1%
Change (in Points)	- .2		+5.3		-1.8		- .5		- .3		-2.0		- .2	
Doctoral	59.8	61.6	26.0	18.0	5.0	7.9	1.4	2.1	.5	.6	4.3	6.4	1.1	1.3
Change (in Points)	-1.8		+8.0		-2.9		- .7		- .1		-2.1		- .2	
Masters (incl. Special)	72.1	71.4	18.6	14.9	2.6	3.7	1.3	1.7	.7	.9	2.8	4.7	.8	.9
Change in Pts.	+ .7		+3.7		-1.1		- .4		- .2		-1.9		- .1	
													- .5	

* as at Dec. 1, 1969

† as at May 31, 1969



DEGREES AWARDED

	Fall Convocation			Academic Year				
	1969	1968	1967	68/69	67/68	66/67	65/66	64/65
Ph.D.	129	87	72	179	162	146	143	105
Phil.M.	10	10	7	17	17	14	5	1
M.A.	243	261	177	529	413	379	385	317
M.Sc.	84	70	70	171	165	183	32	-
M.B.A.	8	9	2	69	65	50	55	32
LL.M.	2	3	1	4	2	4	-	1
M.S.	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
M.A.Sc.	65	67	59	143	116	98	99	90
M.Eng.	20	14	5	26	9	-	-	-
D.CL.Sc.	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-
M.Arch.	-	3	1	14	12	11	6	5
M.Sc. (Pl)	5	1	2	18	9	16	5	1
M.Sc.F.	3	2	1	5	2	7	3	4
M.Sc.D.	3	1	6	2	7	3	5	3
Mus.M.	2	2	1	13	5	2	-	-
Mus.Doc.	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-
M.S.W.	10	78	84	160	84	80	51	68
D.S.W.	1	1	2	2	3	-	-	1
M.L.S.	7	1	2	13	8	12	2	5
M.Ed.	7	10	4	324	226	180	165	132
Ed.D.	4	4	1	8	9	8	1	9
M.Sc.Phm.	-	1	8	4	11	5	4	5
Dip. R.E.E.S.	-	-	2	-	3	1	1	-
Dip. Dev. St.	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
	603	625	507	1704	1328	1202	*964	*780
Percentage of change	-3.5	+23.3	+12.7	+28.3	+10.5	+24.7	+23.6	+17.9

* * Not including Agriculture and Veterinary degrees.

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Monday, 15th December, 1969, at York University, commencing at 9:15 a.m.

Minute

1620

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.
Dr. R. Gerstein
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes
Dr. M. J. Lavigne
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.
Dr. R. J. Rossiter
Dr. D. W. Slater

Mr. H. A. Cotnam

Mr. E. E. Stewart Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon
Mr. J. S. Bancroft
Mr. J. D. McCullough

1621

YORK UNIVERSITY BRIEF

The Committee met with a delegation from York University consisting of the following persons:

Mr. W. P. Scott, Chairman, Board of Governors
Mr. F. S. Chalmers, Chancellor
Dr. M. G. Ross, President and Vice-Chancellor
Professor H. W. Arthurs, Member of Executive of Senate
Mr. J. A. Becker, Assistant Vice-President
(College Liaison and Student Services)
Mr. T. Boyd, Student Member of Executive of Senate
Dr. G. A. P. Carrothers, Dean, Faculty of Environmental Studies
Professor W. B. Carter, Member of Executive of Senate
Mr. G. Clarke, CPUO Representative
Dr. M. J. Collie, Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies
Dr. J. J. Conway, Master of Founders College
Professor W. H. Coons, Chairman of Y. U. Faculty Association
Professor K. H. M. Creal, Vice-Chairman of Senate
Professor W. E. Echard, Member of Executive of Senate
Mr. W. D. Farr, Secretary of the University
Professor S. Friedland, Member of Executive of Senate
Dr. C. D. Fowle, Master of Vanier College

Dr. J. M. Gillies, Dean, Faculty of Administrative
Studies
Professor J. G. Green, Member of Executive of Senate
Professor H. S. Harris, Chairman, Senate Academic
Policy and Planning Committee
Dr. D. M. Healy, Vice-President (Academic)
Dr. J. Heller, Dean, Faculty of Fine Arts
Dr. A. C. Johnson, Vice-President (Academic Services)
Mr. P. Koster, President of the Council of the York
Student Federation
Mr. A. T. Lambert, Member of the Board of Governors
Dean G. E. LeDain, Osgoode Hall Law School
Dr. D. E. Maxwell, Master of Winters College
Mr. T. F. O'Connell, Director of Libraries
Mr. H. B. Parkes, Vice-President (Finance)
Dr. R. C. Rae, Director of the Centre for Continuing
Education
Dr. Virginia Rock, Master of College E
Dr. J. T. Saywell, Member of Executive of Senate and
Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science
Dr. H. I. Schiff, Member of Executive of Senate and
Dean, Faculty of Science
Mr. W. W. Small, Vice-President (Administration)
Dr. G. Tatham, Master of McLaughlin College
Dr. A. V. Tucker, Principal-Designate, Glendon College
Dr. R. W. I. Urquhart, Member, Board of Governors
Professor J. W. Yolton, Member of Executive of Senate

Mr. W. P. Scott, Chairman of the Board of Governors, welcomed the Committee to York University and, briefly, made some introductory remarks concerning the difficulties York University was facing in a period of what he felt was a curtailment of funds. He stressed, particularly, the problems which faced the University as a result of the delay in construction of College V.

President Ross, referring to the brief, described the organization of the University as outlined in Appendix C. He reported that the appointment of another Vice-President, for Student Services, was anticipated in the next year and that enrolment should continue to increase until by 1980 there would be approximately 20,000 day students and an equal number of night students enrolled in programs at York. He stressed the need for a capital allowance for part-time students, indicating Atkinson College's unique position in this regard. He requested, as well, that consideration be given to separating for capital entitlement purposes Glendon College from the main campus, since the surplus space which was available there, at a distance of 13 miles, could not be utilized effectively by those situated on the main campus.

Dr. Wright noted the increase of graduate students from 10 per cent to 25 per cent of total enrolment by 1980. He reported

that the Committee had observed the previous year that the expectations of the Ontario universities appeared to provide for more graduate students than were either required or could be supplied by the available undergraduate population. Mr. Johnson explained that, in the opinion of officials of York University, the pattern of development in graduate studies was justified as a result of the location of the University within a large metropolitan region. Dean Collie indicated, as well, the hope that the University could continue to have a "leavening" of students from other countries.

Dean Crowe, in response to a question, indicated that 50 per cent of Atkinson students came from outside Metropolitan Toronto. Dr. Wright indicated that the Committee would welcome information concerning the need for part-time studies and data related to part-time enrolment.

A. Building Program

Mr. Small outlined briefly the reasons for the suggested program of capital development listed on page 4 of the brief. He reminded the Committee that the University had been operating on one type and scale of development at a time when the interim capital formula introduced a different set of criteria. As a result, the University faced great difficulty in making such a radical change quickly. He suggested that adjustments be made in the capital formula to allow for York's specific requirements, as previously mentioned by President Ross. In addition, he recommended that consideration be given to increasing the value of the space standard and the dollar allowance per unit. Mr. Small spoke, as well, of the long-range planning process being carried on at York University and mentioned that consideration was being given to management contracts and system building techniques. He indicated that the University would favour co-operating with other institutions in this area.

In reply, Dr. Wright indicated that the Committee had already acknowledged the necessity of including part-time students in some way in the capital formula. He questioned the ability of the public sector to support the costs anticipated with the new buildings proposed in the brief, to which Mr. Small replied that these buildings had already been planned. Mr. Small suggested that the higher costs for these buildings would be offset by savings in future buildings if systems building techniques were adopted. He stressed the need, too, for early decisions for advanced planning.

B. Programs Proposed for Introduction in 1970-71

A brief discussion was held concerning new programs during which Dr. Wright explained, with respect to teacher education, that the Committee had already expressed its concern

that there be a comprehensive planning base for teacher education. Dean Saywell indicated that the plans for teacher education at York represented a unique approach which he felt was deserving of special support, as indicated in the brief.

C. Operational Needs Above Formula

During the discussion of this item Dr. Wright explained that the costs of initiating the program in the Faculty of Environmental Studies should be met by internal re-allocation of the University's budget, not by extra-formula grants. Mr. Stewart explained that approval for new programs was required if these were to receive Provincial support and that York University had been told, two years previously, that it could proceed with a number of proposed new programs, including Environmental Studies, if these could be financed from regular funds. It was therefore inappropriate, now, to seek special extra-formula support for such programs.

With respect to the request for special grants for bilingualism at Glendon College, Mr. Stewart reported that negotiations were being carried on with the Federal Government for special support and that Glendon College had been included in those institutions listed by Ontario for this purpose.

Dr. Slater explained that the costs of teacher education were being studied by a subcommittee of which he was Chairman and that it was anticipated that, following this study, it was hoped that allowance could be made for the transfer of teachers' colleges to universities and for development of faculties of education within the general framework of the operating grants formula.

D. Interim Supplementary Grants for Atkinson College

Dean Crowe spoke at length of the need for additional funds for operating purposes for part-time students. He indicated that the amount requested in the brief represented approximately that which would have been received by the University had the part-time allowance been calculated at one-fifth instead of one-sixth. He suggested that, since students normally undertook five courses per academic year on a full-time basis, one-fifth was a more reasonable rate for calculating part-time entitlements. He requested, specifically, that the Committee on University Affairs accept the principle of equality of support for part-time students and suggested that the Committee recommend a one-fifth grant for those universities who satisfied criteria guaranteeing that they are giving adequate attention and providing sufficient facilities and services for part-time students. There followed a considerable discussion concerning enrolment patterns, the background of students

enrolling in part-time studies at York University, and the benefits which would accrue to the University and to the students if they were treated in the same manner as full-time students.

E. Additional Comments and Submissions

Dr. Coons, speaking on behalf of the Faculty Association, expressed concern lest the quality of teaching be allowed to degenerate through a lack of funds. He reported that the University was striving to find ways to improve productivity, but at the same time indicated the need for an adequate level of support for faculty salaries.

Mr. Paul Koster presented the student brief to the Committee, copies of which were distributed to the members. Mr. C. Wilson presented the brief of the Atkinson College Association, copies of which were also distributed.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Monday, 15th December, 1969, in the Board Room of the Department of University Affairs commencing at 2:30 p.m.

Minute

1622

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.
Dr. R. Gerstein
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes
Dr. M. J. Lavigne
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.
Dr. R. J. Rossiter
Dr. D. W. Slater

Mr. H. A. Cotnam

Mr. E. E. Stewart Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon
Mr. J. S. Bancroft
Mr. J. D. McCullough

1623

ONTARIO COLLEGE OF ART

The Committee met with a delegation from the Ontario College of Art consisting of the following representatives:

Mr. F. E. Fletcher, Chairman of Council
Mr. G. W. Butt, Acting Principal
Mr. O. W. Wilson, Business Administrator
Mr. D. W. McGibbon, Treasurer
Mr. F. Arbuckle, Chairman, Advertising Department
Mr. David Hall-Humpherson, Faculty Representative
Mrs. Elizabeth Dales, Faculty Representative
Mr. Eric Freifeld, Faculty Representative
Mr. John Newman, Faculty Representative
Mr. A. Holley, President, Students Administrative Council
Mr. J. Gullick, Vice-President, Students Administrative Council

After introducing the members of his delegation Mr. Fletcher read the memorandum which was contained in the OCA brief.

During the discussion which followed, Dr. Wright referred to the operating figures which had been submitted earlier, in response to which Mr. McGibbon explained that the firm of

Woods, Gordon had been employed to undertake a salary survey. He described the basis for the estimates of costs which appeared in that submission.

There followed a lengthy discussion centering around the indications that the space required for operation of the College of Art would need to be doubled in the immediate future, not for purposes of growth but rather to provide proper facilities for the students enrolled. Dr. Wright indicated that evidence was required, including detailed space analyses, before any decisions could be taken in this regard. He indicated that the Committee would want to see the data for the Ontario College of Art compared with that of similar institutions in other jurisdictions, since it is a unique institution in Ontario.

Mr. Holley asked about the status of the students at this meeting. He explained that the students had had no access to the material submitted and that, therefore, they had been unable to prepare adequately for the discussion in advance. Dr. Wright replied that the students were considered as part of the delegation and that, while it was not the responsibility of the Committee on University Affairs to resolve the College's internal problems of communication, he saw no reason why the students should not have had access to the material which was submitted.

The representatives of the Faculty Association reiterated the frustration felt by the Faculty and the students at not having an opportunity to participate and contribute in the planning function. Specifically, they mentioned the fact that they had not had any part in the outside study undertaken by the Council.

After some further general discussion concerning the needs of the College, both in terms of space and operating support, the delegation withdrew at 4:00 p.m.

1624 ART GALLERY OF ONTARIO

The Committee met with a delegation from the Art Gallery of Ontario consisting of the following:

Mr. E. C. Bovey, President
Mr. W. J. Withrow, Director
Mr. R. N. Steiner, Vice-President
Mr. J. D. Creshley, Vice-President
Mr. M. George, Secretary-Treasurer
Mr. R. M. Thomson, Finance

Mr. Bovey introduced the members of his delegation to the Committee and presented some general remarks concerning the briefs which were submitted to the Committee.

Dr. Wright noted that the Art Gallery was requesting a 70 per

cent increase in support for operating costs, a level of increase which was difficult to support, particularly under existing economic circumstances. Mr. Steiner explained that the real increase was 41 per cent, of which 12-1/2 per cent represented salary components reflecting the rise in the cost of living plus allowance for eight to ten additional staff members; 10 per cent represented the reintroduction into the budget of an allowance of \$100,000 for the purchase of works of art which had been removed from last year's budget; 9-1/2 per cent represented new projects, and a further 9 per cent the result of increased maintenance costs.

Referring to the brief, Mr. Withrow described the plans for extension of activities beyond the Metropolitan Toronto area. He reported that a T.V. extension officer was coming on to staff and that workshops and seminars throughout the Province were being expanded.

There followed a general discussion concerning the operating costs of the Art Gallery and the function and role of that institution.

With respect to capital development, Mr. Bovey referred to the brief in which plans for development were outlined. He explained that the Moore Gallery must be started in the spring of 1970 and that the master plan had been phased in order to work within the co-ordinated development for institutions and organizations of this nature. Dr. Wright noted that enlargement of the Gallery by 300,000 square feet represented an ambitious enterprise which might be difficult to support. He noted that it was anticipated that each phase could be developed independently. There followed some discussion concerning the cost factors indicated in the brief, during which it was noted that the figure of \$60 per gross square foot appeared rather high, particularly with 67 per cent of the area being used for non-display purposes.

Dr. Slater commended the delegation on the idea developed for the mall. He indicated that he had been impressed by the Lawson study and, conversely, singularly unimpressed by the Price, Waterhouse study.

Mr. Stewart explained that it would be necessary to get an indication of the total support available from the Province for cultural and educational organizations and then relate them to the institutions concerned before it would be possible to make specific recommendations on any particular program of expansion.

The delegation withdrew at 5:35 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held
on Tuesday, 16th December, 1969, in the Board
Room of the Department of University Affairs
at 9:00 a.m.

Minute
1625

PRESENT

Dr. D. T. Wright	Chairman
Dr. M. E. Arthur	
The Honourable L. M. Frost, P.C., Q.C.	
Dr. R. Gerstein	
Mr. J. O'N. Hughes	
Dr. M. J. Lavigne	
Mr. R. W. Mitchell, Q.C.	
Dr. R. J. Rossiter	
Dr. D. W. Slater	

Mr. H. A. Cotnam

Mr. E. E. Stewart	Secretary
Mr. A. P. Gordon	
Mr. J. D. McCullough	

1626

ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM BRIEF

The Committee received a delegation from the Royal Ontario Museum comprising the following:

Mr. R. G. Meech, Chairman of the Board
Mr. J. H. Crang, Member of the Board
Mr. P. C. Swann, Director
Mr. V. Roberts, Financial Administrator

In his introductory remarks, Mr. Swann reported that the Museum was rapidly taking its place as one of the foremost on the Continent and that, hopefully, it would be brought up to an acceptable level of operating with approval of the 1970-71 budget. He stressed the need for additional physical facilities and pointed out that there had been no addition to the building within the past 40 years, with the exception of the Planetarium which had been provided at no cost to the Province. As a matter of interest, he noted that almost one-half of a million people visited the Planetarium during its first year of operation.

Dr. Wright noted that the request for operating grant represented an increase of 24 per cent over the current year's expenditure. He expressed concern whether the Provincial budget would permit increases of such magnitude. In the discussion which followed, Mr. Swann reported that \$300,000

had been raised from private sources for the gifts fund. The interest from this fund is spent annually for new acquisitions. He reported, as well, that \$190,000 had been raised in addition to the Provincial grant of \$175,000 for the new restaurant.

Because of the limitations of space, Mr. Swann explained that no staff were added to departments unless space was available for them. The practice of converting galleries into offices and for other administrative purposes had been discontinued, thus the additional staff indicated in the proposed budget were primarily support staff.

Speaking of capital requirements, Mr. Swann expressed the hope that a new wing could be built for the Art and Archaeology Departments, along Bloor Street, which would have proper temperature and humidity control. If this were done, it would then be possible to expand the science area and to provide space for one-half of the University of Toronto Botany Department. He suggested that it would be necessary to approximately double the existing space by adding some 400,000 square feet. If this could be built as a shell, he indicated that it would then be feasible to ask industry and business to provide the funding for individual galleries within it.

Mr. Meech asked that the Museum's formal request for acquisition of the old McMaster building be noted, specifically. He explained that they had been informed the University might use that building for university purposes but that there now seemed some possibility that the University would sell it for commercial purposes. The Museum Directors wished a commitment from the University, he said, to allow the Museum to acquire the property if a decision was made not to continue to use it for university purposes.

Referring to his letter of 12th November, 1969, to Mr. Stewart concerning capital requirements, Mr. Swann mentioned the failure to establish a committee on rationalization of museums, galleries and similar institutions. He indicated that he agreed with the principle embodied in the proposal to establish such a committee, but wondered whether the best interests of the Museum had been served by waiting for its establishment rather than proceeding unilaterally with plans for development. There followed a fairly lengthy general discussion during which the need for any development plans being designed in such a way as to permit phasing was recognized, as was the fact that the existing site of the Museum was the most appropriate one which could be found within the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Mr. Swann requested assistance from the Government in

resolving the problems of land acquisitions, since both the University and the Museum were publicly supported institutions. He explained that the University was asking for compensation for the land occupied by the Planetarium and that the Museum Directors were facing real problems in their attempts to resolve the question of acquiring further land from the University. He explained that if he knew the outcome of the land question it would be possible to plan effectively for future needs, but that as long as that question remained in abeyance it was very difficult to know what type of further expansion would be feasible.

In response to a question from Mr. Stewart, Mr. Swann indicated that if the Government suggested matching grants at the rate of two dollars in public funds for every dollar raised by the Museum, he would be prepared to attempt to raise the necessary funds on that basis.

Finally, it was agreed that a decision was required concerning the land question and that funds would also be required for programing the expansion of the Museum, possibly an amount of \$50,000 in 1970-71.

Mr. Swann also expressed his concern that the estimates of the cost of building the restaurant were fifty per cent higher than the amount which had been allocated for this purpose. It was suggested that, if a reasonable solution could not be found, it might be necessary to abandon the design which had been produced by the architects and seek a new design from another source which would allow the construction of the restaurant with the funds which were available.

The delegation withdrew at 10:45 a.m.

1627 LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA BRIEF

The Committee received a delegation from the Law Society of Upper Canada comprising the following:

Mr. W. G. C. Howland, Treasurer
Mr. K. Jarvis, Secretary
Mr. R. J. Roberts, Director, Bar Admission Course

Mr. Howland reviewed for the benefit of the Committee the process of legal education as it had developed and explained in some detail the operating pattern of the Bar Admission Course. He explained that the Law Society regarded this 22 week intensive course which each candidate for admission to the Bar must take following a year of service under articles as being an integral part of legal education. In order to accommodate the increased numbers of students and

to incorporate the changes required to allow operation during the summer months, he indicated that the request for assistance amounted to \$554,000 for renovations plus \$327,373 for operating purposes. He reported that it had been decided to increase the tuition fees for this program by \$90.

There followed considerable general discussion, during which Mr. Howland, responding to a question from Dr. Gerstein, indicated that, while it was difficult to judge accurately, it would appear that the current university facilities for training law students would be adequate to meet the needs of the Province. Mr. Stewart noted that in view of the demands being made by would-be candidates and the charge which was raised by members of the opposition during the debates on the Estimates of the Department of University Affairs that discrimination was being practiced against students from Northern Ontario since there was no law school available to them in the North it might be necessary to request the assistance of the Law Society and of the Deans of Law to provide information concerning distribution of students within the law schools.

Mr. Frost noted that, although the Province was being asked to pay for the total cost of legal education, the Law Society retained complete control of the Bar Admission Course. He questioned whether this would be consistent with support provided by the Province for other professions. During the discussion which followed the possibility of encompassing a year of articling within the summer period during a student's LL.B. program was discussed.

Dr. Wright noted that, since the facilities for the program are owned by the Law Society as a private corporation rather than publicly, as are universities, it would be difficult to provide capital assistance for the alterations which were required. He noted that the need for renovations was recognized but that a method of financing which would give due consideration to the ownership and interests of both the Law Society and the Province would be required before any such assistance could be approved by the Government.

The delegation withdrew at 11:45 a.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Secretary

